UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS LIBRARY
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
BOOKSTACKS

The person charging this material is responsible for its return to the library from which it was withdrawn on or before the **Latest Date** stamped below.

Theft, mutilation, and underlining of books are reasons for disciplinary action and may result in dismissal from the University.

To renew call Telephone Center, 333-8400

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

2 4 1986

MAR 2 4 1986

JUN 3 0 1987

FEB 2 7 1995

OCT 2 5 1995

OCT 2 7 1995

DEC 1 2 1998

DEC 0 3 1998

L161—O-1096

THE CHARITY ORGANIZATION MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

A Study in American Philanthropy



THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE CHARITY ORGANIZATION MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

A Study in American Philanthropy

BY

FRANK DEKKER WATSON, PH.D.

PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL WORK,
HAVERFORD COLLEGE

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1922

All rights reserved

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

COPYRIGHT, 1922,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and printed. Published October, 1922.

Press of
J. J. Little & Ives Company
New York, U. S. A.

361
9r333c
cop 3

To

A. E. W.

A FELLOW STUDENT
OF SOCIETY

1083147

"The noblest charity is to prevent a man from accepting charity, and the best alms are to enable a man to dispense with alms."

THE TALMUD.

"If men are friends there is no justice: but when they are just they still need friendship."

ARISTOTLE.

"Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing."

ST. PAUL.

"Whoever walks a furlong without sympathy, walks to his own funeral drest in his shroud."

WHITMAN.

"He who takes an interest in trying to cure poverty in a single case will soon come to find that nothing in politics or industry is foreign to him."

—*The Friendly Visitor,* a leaflet published by the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity.

PREFACE

The material for this study has come from four sources —personal visits to a number of societies, conferences and correspondence with a number of leaders in the movement, as chairman from 1914 to 1921 of a case conference of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity and a survey of the literature of the movement past and present. Since June, 1911, it has been the privilege of the writer to visit from time to time a number of Charity Organization Societies including those on the Pacific Coast and in the South as well as many in the East and Middle West. This has afforded an opportunity to secure first hand from the active workers in the field a statement of the many social problems with which each community is grappling and a record of many of their past successes and failures.

For the more historical parts of the work, the chief source of material has naturally been the printed page, although not a little invaluable historical data were secured from personal interviews with those who were either pioneers in the movement or intimately associated with them. Among the sources of special value were old case records of various societies, their earlier reports, old newspaper files, the Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, now the National Conference of Social Work, and the complete files of *Lend-a-Hand, Charities and the Commons,* and *The Survey;* special volumes such as Gurteen's "Handbook of Charity Organization" (published in 1882), Warner's "American Charities" and others too numerous to mention here but which will be found in the Bibliography included in this volume.

Among those who have rendered assistance the author

takes this opportunity to record his debt of gratitude to Mrs. John M. Glenn, Dr. Edward T. Devine, Mr. Alexander Johnson, Mr. Francis H. McLean and Mr. Porter R. Lee. In addition he wishes to make special mention of the sympathetic interest of Miss Mary E. Richmond, who stood ever ready with helpful advice, and of the scholarly aid of Miss Zilpha D. Smith, who read much of the manuscript covering the history of the movement in the United States in its pioneer days and made many constructive criticisms.

The author would, if space permitted, find great pleasure in acknowledging individually the courteous treatment that he has received as he travelled over the country and enjoyed the co-operation of the many workers in the field.

The author desires finally to acknowledge with most sincere gratitude his debt of obligation to his wife, Amey Eaton Watson, who has not only shown a deep interest in the preparation of this study but also been an able and constructive critic.

In making these acknowledgments, the author by no means implies that any of those here mentioned share his conclusions or even a major part of them. Any errors or failings that may be detected in the final form of the text must be imputed to himself.

Frank D. Watson.

Haverford, Pennsylvania, 1921.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	PREFACE	ix
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	FOREIGN ANTECEDENTS	11
III	ANTECEDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES	64
IV	FUNCTIONS OF A CHARITY ORGANIZATION SOCIETY	94
V	PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF CHARITY ORGANIZATION	114
VI	BEGINNINGS OF THE CHARITY ORGANIZATION MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES	172
VII	EXTENSION OF THE MOVEMENT (1883-1895)	222
VIII	THE ERA OF MOVEMENTS FOR THE PREVENTION OF POVERTY (1896-1904)	281
IX	NATIONALIZATION OF THE MOVEMENT (1905-1921)	337
X	THE RENAISSANCE OF SOCIAL CASE WORK (1905-1921 Concluded)	407
XI	TESTS OF EFFICIENCY	444
XII	PREJUDICES AND CRITICISMS	492
XIII	THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHARITY ORGANIZATION	522
	INDEX	555

CHARITY ORGANIZATION MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THIS book is a study of that part of the field of American philanthropy known as the Charity Organization Movement.[1] We are here concerned with but a section of a larger movement which in its turn is but one of the social developments of our times. The century which saw the rise of charity organization will as often be known as the age of humanitarianism as the age of machinery. Some day a complete history of the century will be written from this point of view. In this present volume the writer has set himself a more humble task.

Although the present study covers but a part of a larger movement, it does not suffer from lack of unity. This is due in the first place to the inherent nature of the part which contains within itself certain essential and characteristic features easily discernible. The earliest charity organization societies in the United States adopted certain so-called fundamental principles. In the main, these principles or methods have been consistently adhered to with a constant faith in their usefulness. It is

[1] This excludes a discussion of both current Catholic and Jewish charity as embodied in the Societies of St. Vincent de Paul and the United Hebrew Charities respectively.

due in the second place to the geographical limits set for the study. The economic background of America has definitely influenced the development of charity organization after its transplanting from Europe.

Before proceeding further, a brief explanation of the term charity organization society will aid the reader.[1] A charity organization society is briefly a society for organizing charity.[2] "When a person sees a need, wins the coöperation of those who are interested or should be, gains their aid in devising a plan to meet that need and retains their coöperation in carrying out that plan or some better one that may later develop, until the need is permanently met, he is "organizing charity." In the complex life of modern communities, such needs come constantly to notice, thereby necessitating the formation of a *society* for organizing charity to supplement or aid the individual in a wise expression of his benevolence. Such societies are "only devices which men have created in order to help them to be charitable more effectively." [3] The function then of the societies whose origin and development is the theme of this study is to help "all who will work together to find out, need by need, what the best way out of each difficulty is, best for those on whom the need presses most heavily and best for the community at large; and to see each problem through to a final solution." [4]

The striking thing about the birth of the charity organization movement is the reason which actuated those who called it into being. The pioneers inaugurated "the new charity" because there were so many already. "Religious

[1] For a fuller discussion, see chapters IV and V.

[2] "Society for Organizing Charity" is the name of the Philadelphia and Providence societies. When the movement produced an association including in its membership societies of the United States and Canada, it adopted this form of title feeling that it more clearly stated the function of its members than either of the more popular titles, Charity Organization Society or Associated Charities.

[3] Porter R. Lee, "Treatment," a pamphlet published by the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation (1910), p. 11.

[4] Zilpha D. Smith, from correspondence with the author.

and secular activity in philanthropy had created, in our large cities, many different agencies. However well these may have been organized internally, they were not organized with reference to each other, and this fact led to the formation of charity organization societies."[1]

The new movement was really the introduction of a new method for utilizing the existing charitable forces and resources of a community, a method that may be of use to both individuals and associations of individuals whether they term themselves charity organization societies or not. In fact, the charity organization movement has so profoundly influenced the social thought of the day that many of its methods are employed by child welfare societies, hospital social service departments, courts of domestic relations, juvenile courts, and the Red Cross in its work of civilian relief. It would make an interesting study, did space permit, to trace the growth and spread of the so-called "C. O. S." methods among the various social agencies of to-day working with individuals.

The scientific study of society from the evolutionary point of view leaves little room for the belief in Minerva-like beginnings in social movements. Although the birth of the charity organization movement was characterized by a *new* method of organizing charity, an examination of the writings of the pioneers in this country bears witness to the truth of the foregoing statement. One of the early leaders[2] in America states that it was the deductions and combinations of certain results from the work of Ozanam in Paris, Dr. Chalmers in Edinburgh, of the personal service and life of Edward Denison in the East of London, of the well-known municipal plan in Elberfeld, of the much older plan tested in Hamburg, and of other studies, work and experiments widely separated in place and scope which became the initiative of the charity

[1] M. E. Richmond, "Charitable Coöperation," Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, 1901, p. 298.

[2] George B. Buzelle, General Secretary Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, from 1881 to 1893.

organization movement, and adds in conclusion "the principles of Charity Organization are as old as the mutual needs and mutual obligations of society." [1] Wherever we place the beginnings, the roots of modern philanthropy are ancient. It is the foliage only that is new with the changing seasons. An adequate study of the movement here under review must therefore begin at a much earlier date than 1873, and in places far distant from Germantown, Philadelphia, the first community in America to claim a Charity Organization Society.[2] For this reason there is first given in this book a section reviewing in brief the various antecedents of the movement which is the especial concern of this study.

The writer feels that in this age of popular discussion of social questions—an age in which the phrase, "the abolition of poverty," has been coined and is gaining increasing circulation, an apology is hardly needed for the appearance of a study of a movement whose chief concern to-day is with the cure and ultimate prevention of poverty. Furthermore, the fact that the movement is not ephemeral if nothing else makes it significant to all students of society. "The charity organization idea does have extraordinary staying power. Not being dependent upon the outcome of a political campaign, or upon an endowed foundation, it defies unpopularity and misrepresentation, it makes its way by sheer force of its reasonableness, by its scientific quality." [3] The words

[1] George B. Buzelle, "Charity Organization in Cities," *The Charities Review*, Vol. II, p. 3 (1892).

Josephine Shaw Lowell, another pioneer, wrote in the preface of her book on "Public Relief and Private Charity": "There is not, perhaps, an original thought or suggestion in it:—an important part of it is direct and verbal quotation; and to every student of the subject it will be apparent that almost the whole of it is taken from the writings of wise men and women who have lived during the past hundred years." "Public Relief and Private Charity," (1884), see preface.

[2] Buffalo, New York, was the first large American city to have a Charity Organization Society, organized in 1877.

[3] E. T. Devine, "Social Ideals Implied in Present American Programs

used in 1882 by one of the earliest American writers on the subject, "The present volume owes its publication to the fact of the widespread interest which is being felt in every section of the country in Charity Organization," [1] are as appropriate to-day as when first written. The movement is still in its infancy. During the last fifteen years it has grown more than during all the years before. The number of societies to-day is at least double that existing in 1905. There are still, however, whole regions of vast extent in this country where even the meaning of family case work [2] is unknown.

The present volume will have failed in one of its objects if it does not serve as an interpretation of the spirit of charity organization as well as a record of past failures and achievements. Too many current criticisms of so-called "organized charity" resolve themselves upon analysis into mere prejudices. Others are well founded, since the work of some societies is poor and they themselves are hardly charity organization societies save in name. Too many members of boards of directors fail to appreciate that there is a "new view" [3] of charity,—that new wine is ever being poured into old wine skins. Societies under their control are not in popular phraseology "on the map." Too many busy social workers have acquired what has been well termed the "breathless habit." It is to be regretted that many workers do not grasp in the beginning of their professional careers the significance of the age-long slow changes in the manifestations of the spirit of charity, and do not appreciate the fact that the forces of civilization have forever been moulding and remoulding the objects and methods of

of Voluntary Philanthropy," Publications of the American Sociological Society, Vol. VII, p. 187 (1912).

[1] S. H. Gurteen, "A Handbook of Charity Organization," p. 3 (1882).

[2] Family case work and family work are terms used increasingly to-day as synonymous with charity organization work. They will so be used throughout this study.

[3] E. T. Devine, "The New View." A foreword by the Editor, *Charities and the Commons,* Vol. XVIII, pp. 87-90 (1907).

charity. Few social workers realize that so recently as the "forties," there was an impulse almost nation-wide for establishing Associations for Improving the Condition of the Poor,[1]—an impulse which if it had evolved and not crystalized might have made unnecessary the movement whose history is here recorded.

One value of a study covering so wide a geographical area is the comparisons that it makes possible between places. The societies differ very much in details of method, even among the leading ones, whose officials are in frequent touch with each other; but these differences are largely due to the necessity of adaptation to local conditions. There are unfortunately other differences among societies. In the phrase of the students of social evolution, some of the societies are still in "the stone age" of the practice of charity. In brief, progress in the movement has been uneven; here a new society, there a society atrophying or undergoing rejuvenation.

A word as to the division of field covered. Chapter II on "Foreign Antecedents" contains a bird's-eye view of those organized efforts abroad for dealing with poverty which paved the way for the charity organization movement in America. Chapter III contains a similar review of the history of charity in the United States antecedent to the charity organization movement. Chapter IV is devoted to a discussion of Functions of a Charity Organization Society, while Chapter V presents the underlying principles and methods of charity organization. Chapter VI traces the origin and development of the movement down to 1883, by which time the several almost independent beginnings had taken place. Chapter VII follows the development thereafter to 1896, as now this city, and then that took the next forward step. Chapter VIII reviews the progress of the movement from 1896, by

[1] Frank Tucker, formerly General Agent of the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, "What a Charity Worker is Expected to Do," *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 35 (1901).

which time the industrial depression of 1893-94 had spent its force, to 1905. This is the era of beginnings of movements whose end is the prevention of poverty. Chapters IX and X carry the history along from 1905 when the movement entered the period of national expansion to 1921, during which period the methods of charity organization have been subjected to careful analyses and enrichment. The relations of charity organization societies to other organizations have become so many and intimate that an adequate account of their work traverses the entire field of modern philanthropy. It has therefore been necessary because of this interrelation of social forces and the unity of social work to make frequent cross references to related movements in both the field of thought and of action.

In Chapter XI some standards and tests of efficiency as applied to charity organization societies are presented. The following chapter examines current criticisms and prejudices of charity organization societies, while Chapter XIII concludes the study with a statement of the philosophy which underlies the movement and a discussion of the relation of family case work to movements for improving social conditions.

In this connection the author regrets exceedingly that the limitation of space forbids the inclusion in this volume of a fuller biographical treatment of the pioneers of the charity organization movement in America, for wonderful power of personality was welded into the beginning of the movement. The names of Robert Treat Paine of Boston, John Glenn of Baltimore, Josephine Shaw Lowell of New York, and Oscar Carlton McCulloch of Indianapolis will long be remembered by all who cherish the noble traditions of years of beginning and struggle, not to mention a longer list of those who served the cause of the organization of charity with distinction.

It now remains to add a word as to *Methodology*. Throughout the book the method employed has been

not only historical but philosophical and critical as well; philosophical in that an effort has been made throughout the study to explain the origin of the movement and to indicate the economic and social forces that have shaped its growth; critical in that the movement is viewed as an effort looking toward social adjustment; a goal that is definite, if not fixed, and progress toward which is subject to scientific measurement.[1] In all criticisms it should ever be borne in mind that there is a wide difference between showing where a movement fails and that it is a failure. In the historical sections it has been the aim to show how the concepts with which the movement began have developed and have been applied under changing conditions.

The field covered by the present study is large and its adequate treatment offers several difficulties. Two methods of arranging the data naturally suggest themselves,—one to record year by year the development of the movement in each community—the other to discuss in general the development of the movement over a series of years. The latter method has been used, as the chief concern has been to keep in the foreground the story of the evolution of the movement as a whole.

Throughout the study a more general use of statistics was found impossible for reasons which are almost obvious. The earlier case records of all the societies are inadequate and afford no basis of comparison with later records. Even at present there is no universal case record system used, though there is a definite tendency toward uniformity. Furthermore, the time and money required per case varies for a number of reasons. The

[1] As early as 1884 Alexander Johnson, then chairman of the Committee on Charity Organization of the National Conference of Charities and Correction pointed out that "at any rate we (charity organizationists) ought to be able to present a candid and trustworthy statement as to the growth or the abatement of the evils we are working to suppress, so as to measure the value of our methods of work." Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, 1884, p. 321.

case of a widowed mother usually makes a bigger demand on the resources of a society than that of the homeless man. In addition, the personal equation in widowed mother cases is so great that statistical comparisons often have little or no value. Because of location certain societies have a relatively larger proportion of certain types of cases than others, e.g., the Seattle society has many cases of desertion and relatively few widow cases. Jacksonville and Savannah have large numbers of homeless cases. For this reason a comparison of budget and cases handled by the respective societies means little, not to mention the fact that there are other considerations vitiating a comparison, such as the effect of environment on the amount of material relief necessary.[1] Other factors limit the use of statistics in a study of this kind certainly for comparisons of one period with another. There is first the increase in the standard of relief brought about by a rapidly accumulating fund of medical knowledge and the growing realization of the close causal relation between disease and poverty. There is secondly the change in the cost of living particularly during the last ten years, and thirdly, the increasing social resources such as hospitals, sanitoria, municipal lodging houses that a society may to-day utilize in its daily work but which the older societies had to do without in their earlier days or else labor to secure, meantime using or creating makeshifts. Not a few societies to-day find their work handicapped by the lack of proper agencies, both private and public for caring for dependents, defectives and delinquents.

Notwithstanding all that has just been said, it does not follow that standards of efficiency are not possible in the

[1] For example, on the Pacific Coast and in the South, fuel is a negligible factor. Outdoor work on streets and roads is possible the year round. In Seattle because of cool summers and cool water supplied in every home from mountain sources, ice is not an absolute necessity. There is also the difference in the cost of living between the country, small town, city and metropolis.

field of charity organization, though as we have already noted, the indefinable, unrecordable personal relationship is probably a bigger factor in social work than in almost any other field of human activity. It is therefore one of the purposes of this study to suggest tests of efficiency which may at least prove helpful, though it is obvious that no one set of tests can adequately meet all environing differences. The charity organization society has come into existence to fulfill a definite function. Like all other institutions, it should be constantly "weighed in the balance" to ascertain how nearly it is meeting its obligations and to give assurance that perchance it is not impeding another possible organization from meeting more satisfactorily the social need. Here as with the Church, State, the School and Industry, one must be constantly reminded that all these institutions are made for man and not man for them.

CHAPTER II

FOREIGN ANTECEDENTS

THE roots of modern charity lie buried deep in human nature and are as old as man himself. The psychological basis of altruism is found in man's instinct of gregariousness.[1] In the remotest depths of antiquity that we can penetrate are to be discovered evidences that men felt compassion for the poor and extended relief to the distressed.[2] In fact, if one were to search out the origin of sympathy, the great social bond, he would have to go back to still lowlier beginnings than the birth of the human family, for it is fundamental in all animal life where the parent provides for the offspring. "Far back in the animal world," writes Ellwood, "we begin to find the care of weaker individuals by family groups."[3] A history of the unfolding of the charitable impulse in man and of all the forms that this wellnigh universal impulse has taken would be an attractive task, but one which would at this time take us too far afield. We must here be content to trace the development of not *all* forms of *organized* charitable impulse, but only of those forms which have had a marked influence on the movement which is the especial concern of this study.

[1] See W. Trotter, "Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War" (1916).

[2] For further evidence in this connection see Yu-Yue Tsu, "The Spirit of Chinese Philanthropy." Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, Vol. L, No. 1 (1912).

[3] Charles A. Ellwood, "The Functions of Charity in Modern Society," *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XIX, p. 1349 (1908).

For an interesting statement of the evolution of sympathy in the animal world, see pp. 92-94 McDougall's "Social Psychology." See also Kropotkin, "Mutual Aid in the Animal World."

It is difficult to understand the great influence that charity has exerted on the acts of man unless one realizes how religion, especially Christianity, has reinforced by its teachings the instinct of sympathy and altruism. Along with other mighty truths entering the world with the birth of Christianity, "came a new ideal of human nature; a sense of value in each human soul for its own sake, however degraded or forsaken that soul might be. Out of the new faith in the fatherhood of God flowed this other new faith in the brotherhood of men, and it made one of the great transitions in the evolution of the human race. The poor and rejected, the submerged of mankind, were regarded in a wholly new light when they were thus accepted as essential parts of the one body in Christ. The solidarity of the race became a practical belief. If one suffered, all suffered with him. The 'Caritas' of the Christians gave a quality and color to human relations which classic civilization never knew."[1]

But beautiful as was the new sense of value of the individual which Christianity brought, "it brought with it its own new danger. The new zeal for charity came to demand the poverty on which to spend itself. The new philanthropy created a new mendicancy. Poverty grew by what it fed on."[2] Moreover, with success came degeneration; as the church became an institution administer-

[1] Francis G. Peabody, "The Problem of Charity," *Charities Review*, Vol. III, p. 4 (1893). See also Amos G. Warner, "American Charities," Rev. ed., p. 6 (1908), and J. G. W. Uhlhorn, "Christian Charity in the Ancient Church," Book First, Chap. I (1883).

For a brief review of the charity of ancient Hebrews see Rabbi Martin A. Meyer, "The Charity of the Ancient World," in the Second Annual Report of the Municipal Charities Commission, City of Los Angeles, Cal., pp. 12-18 (1914-1915).

For an exposition of the rabbinical teaching governing the charity of the Jews in the Middle Ages and still held as authoritative among orthodox Jews see "The Section on Charity from the Schulhan Arukh," translated by Louis Feinberg. "Studies in Social Work," number 6, *The New York School of Philanthropy*, November, 1915.

For an exposition of principles and methods of Jewish social service in the United States see Boris Bogen, "Jewish Philanthropy," 1917.

[2] Francis G. Peabody, "The Problem of Charity," *Charities Review*, Vol. III, p. 4 (1893).

ing progressively larger revenues, "its service of the poor degenerated, partly from worldliness, and partly from 'other worldliness.' " [1]

Although it may be a sorry day for humanity when some aspects of the mediæval conception of charity entirely depart from the world,[2] the motives of much of the philanthropy of the Middle Ages and the form of the expression of practically all of it differ so markedly from the so-called "scientific charity" of the twentieth century that a discussion of it finds no logical place in this study.[3]

If the movement under review were merely the result of the application to the problem of human misery of the scientific point of view, always characterized in all fields by a searching for *causes,* this section of our study could take cognizance of little before the eighteenth century. Then it was that one of the bases of modern charity came into being,—the wave of humanitarian sentiment which rose to power and spread abroad a new view of man and society, fostering a scientific spirit which stimulated inquiry and investigation into all questions. However the movement here under review is, beside being

[1] Amos G. Warner, "American Charities," Rev. ed., p. 6 (1908).

[2] See Editorial by E. T. Devine, "A Mediæval Efficiency Test," *The Survey,* Feb. 7, 1914, pp. 596-597.

"If I were trying," writes Dr. Crothers, "to induce a young man or a young woman to enter the way of charitable effort in our modern times, I should go back to the classic expressions—the old Christian expressions if you please—to the men of the spirit of St. Francis in all the ages down to the present time, who gave themselves utterly in an enthusiasm for humanity, not hoping for reward, nor calculating, and I would say: 'Here is the opportunity, in these modern times, for the very greatest self-sacrifice, self-giving, that the world has ever seen.' " Samuel M. Crothers, D.D., *Charities,* Vol. IX, p. 577 (1902).

For an understanding of the motives of much of the charity of Middle Ages see "Sermon on Alms," by Saint John Chrysostom (347-407 A.D.), translated by Margaret M. Sherwood, Studies in Social Work, number 10, The New York School of Philanthropy (February, 1917).

For an account of Mediæval Jewish charity see Rabbi S. H. Sonneschein, "Hebrew Charities during the Middle Ages," Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, 1883, p. 323.

[3] Accounts of the charity that preceded the modern era will be found in C. S. Loch, "Charity and Social Life" (1910); J. G. W. Uhlhorn, "Christian Charity in the Ancient Church" (1883); Leon Lalleman, "Historie de la Charite" (1902-1910).

a new point of view of misery and its causes, an embodiment of a group of practices previously tried out in different places and times by many laborers, some of whom did not subject misery to the scientific analysis now increasingly common. As it was in part at least the deductions and results from these practices that became the initiative of the charity organization movement, it is necessary to begin not with the humanitarian movement of the eighteenth century but with the work of St. Vincent de Paul a century earlier, before whom it is difficult to find much evidence of the use of methods similar to those which later characterized the charity organization movement.[1]

THE CONTRIBUTION OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL

The days of St. Vincent de Paul (1576-1660) were turbulent ones not only in France but in Europe. Before the Huguenot wars had ceased in France the Thirty Years' War was raging in Germany. In the midst of the disorders in Church and State during this troubled period the sufferings of the poor specially appealed to the heart of Vincent de Paul. They were neglected spiritually as well as temporally, and on all sides one beheld extremes of poverty and ignorance. This French priest, ordained in 1600, was one of those of his time who recognized the fact that a fundamental change in handling the problem of poverty was needed. The charities of his day though well intentioned he believed were "ill regulated." Unlike many of his time, he opposed indiscriminate alms-giving and begging on the streets.

As we are interested only in the contributions which

[1] For an interesting statement of methods urged for the relief of the poor as early as 1526 suggesting not a few principles later to be embodied in the charity organization movement, see "A Letter Addressed to the Senate of Bruges, Concerning the Relief of the Poor or Concerning Human Need," by Juan-Louis Vivès, translated by Margaret M. Sherwood, Studies in Social Work, number 11, The New York School of Philanthropy (February, 1917).

St. Vincent de Paul made to that body of knowledge in the practice of charity which afterward became the basis of the charity organization movement, little need be said of his other humanitarian interests, which were broad, including among them work for children, the insane and prisoners. His work among prisoners (1618) leading to the founding of the "Lazarites," an association of priests organized to work among the outcasts of society and in the aid of prisoners, is well known.[1] It was, however in the field of relief of distress among the poor that his influence was most potent.

On the one hand, he saw about him suffering and misery, on the other wealth and culture. His chief hope in ameliorating the former lay in the possibility of establishing friendly relations between the rich and poor. With this end in view he preached the duty of the more fortunate classes to aid the less fortunate. Christ came to seek and to save that which was lost. He was a comfort to the widow, the poor, and the afflicted: those who would be his followers must do likewise. "To send money is good, but we have not really begun to serve the poor till we visit them," he preached. "The poor," he maintained, "are your masters and mine." His words rang out, "O God! how beautiful are the poor when we see them in the light of faith, while if we judge them according to this world, they seem no doubt despicable." His appeal was essentially religious. Because he thought the church rose above all barriers, he carried himself as the humble equal of any man though he seems to have had no idea of breaking down class distinctions.[2]

To this end St. Vincent de Paul established in 1617 what was known as the "Ladies of Charity." These were

[1] The name "Lazarites" derived from the house in Paris where they lived. The Lazarites or Vincentians are known at home as among the best educators of the secular clergy, and abroad as zealous missionaries.

[2] The quotation just given which would have been foreign to the genius of St. Francis, doubtless emphasizes his own (St. Vincent de Paul's) sense of class distinction.

composed of groups of leisure women whom he organized to visit the poor in their homes. Later, confraternities for men were organized for like purpose until in the early enthusiasm of the movement, something like thirty charity associations were founded. Through them St. Vincent de Paul aimed not only to discourage begging and vagrancy but to encourage generous provision for the aged and the sick and trade training for destitute children.

Not the least remarkable of St. Vincent de Paul's powers was "his faculty of persuading—or rather compelling—the rich to give beyond all measure of what is ordinarily considered charitable. At his bidding women of rank and wealth would give till they had no money left, and would then sell their jewels to meet his persistent claims. Nor would he ever consent that a responsibility once undertaken should be set aside, even in face of what might seem a more pressing need. If the new work was imperative, then it must be met by further sacrifice. In short, he recognized no limits to the duty of giving, whether of money or of self."[1]

Like all pioneers, he had to blaze his own trail, and needless to add, had to learn much by his own mistakes. Thus he soon encountered difficulties in carrying on his work through his "Ladies of Charity." Many of them had little real knowledge of the principles of relief and little real conception of their own abilities for such service. A travelling secretary, Mlle. Le Gras, employed by St. Vincent to supervise the confraternities in different parts of the country and to reform those which had fallen below the standard, found from her experience how untrustworthy the volunteer work of leisured women may be when subject to no control. To belong to the Ladies of Charity "became a fad; besides the ladies wanted to do the pleasant work, and the dirt and disease were

[1] "Charity in the Seventeenth Century," *The Charity Organization Review,* Vol. XXXIV, No. 204 (new series), pp. 365-366 (1913).

offensive as usual. The workers were irregular and uncertain. . . ." [1] To remedy this, Mlle. Le Gras, a person with great powers of eloquence combined with the power of first hand knowledge of the poor and sick, gathered about her women of the working class who were prepared to devote their whole lives under her direction to the work of charity. "It was long before M. Vincent would consent that this community should become an Order under vows and under his own direction, but when once he had consented his devotion to it was unremitting."[2] Thus was founded (1633) the famous organization, the Sisters of Charity. In the main, the ranks of the new order were recruited from the peasant country girls. The form of organization was revolutionary. Its vows were not perpetual. The dress was secular, consisting of the gray habit and cornettes of the country. Its members were not cloistered but in the world attending the sick, the wounded, the dying and the prisoner. While religion was their vocation, their mission was chiefly philanthropic. For this work St. Vincent de Paul devised rules worked out in great detail to guard against indiscriminate giving. Before a case could be visited it had to be "passed" by the treasurer. He divided the poor into three classes: (1) Those who could earn nothing, children, sick, aged. They were to receive full support. (2) Those who could earn half their support. They were to receive half support. (3) Those who could earn but one-fourth of their support. They were to receive three-fourths support.[3]

Thus it may be said to the credit of St. Vincent de Paul that he not only voiced a protest against indiscriminate almsgiving when such protests were rare, but he instituted on a scale before unknown a system of the

[1] S. G. Smith, "Social Pathology," p. 95 (1911); see L. V. E. Bougand, "History of St. Vincent de Paul," translated by Rev. J. Brady (1908).

[2] "Charity in the Seventeenth Century," *The Charity Organization Review,* Vol. XXXIV, No. 204 (new series) pp. 365-366 (1913).

[3] Address by Michael J. Scanlan before the New York School of Philanthropy, 1914.

friendly visitation of the poor,[1] a practice destined to play an important part in the Hamburg system of Public Relief to be discussed next, in the work of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul founded in Paris by Frederick Ozanam in 1833 and named in honor of the man whose work on behalf of the poor has just been described, and finally in the charity organization movement itself.[2]

Contribution of the Hamburg System of Poor Relief

The eighteenth century witnessed a wave of humanitarian sentiment which spread abroad a new view of man and society. Its watchword was "the perfectibility of man," and its cry "a return to Nature." This century also witnessed the rise of the scientific spirit of inquiry which was to question all things anew. The story of the first organized expression of these tendencies in the field of charity is full of interest and instruction.

"About the close of the first decade of the eighteenth century, a very severe plague raged in Hamburg, the wealthiest of the four Free Cities and the intellectual centre at that time of Northern Germany. To overcome this evil, a Sanitary Association was formed and the very first lesson which its members learned was the need of a radical reform in the management of the poor-relief. Hamburg was overrun with vagrants and beggars, attracted by the well-known liberality of its many rich men." [3] The care of the poor, which was in the hands of

[1] Even so late as his seventy-third year, he rode from one end of France to the other, everywhere organizing relief societies for the benefit of the poor who were dying of the famine incident to the Fronde rebellion, and founding new branches of the Sisters of Charity for the care of the sick and starving. For further light on the debt of modern charity to St. Vincent de Paul, see Thomas M. Mulry, "The Church and Charity," *Charities*, Vol. V, No. 27, p. 2 (1900).

[2] E. K. Sanders, "Vincent de Paul, Priest and Philanthropist," pp. 138-159 (1913).

[3] Joseph Henry Crooker, "Problems in American Society," 1889, p. 64. For a more complete account of the Hamburg system than here given, see above book, p. 64-115. The account here given has

the Church, was as a rule neither wise nor ample. The funds collected in poor-boxes of the churches were often diverted toward purely ecclesiastical purposes; when given to the poor, "they were distributed indiscriminately in such a way as to foster rather than suppress beggary."[1]

Spurred to action by the deepening sense of the necessity for a re-organization of the system of public charities, resulting from the experience of the Sanitary Association, and convinced that this work ought to be carried on by secular agencies, a step forward was taken by certain public-spirited citizens under the lead of Syndic Sillen who, in 1711, organized a department of the Sanitary Association, composed of Burgomasters, each of whom was assigned to one of the numerous districts into which the city was divided for the better care of the poor; and it was made the duty of each member of the department to inspect the condition of all destitute persons in his district. It was felt that by friendly and efficient helpfulness it would be possible to cure rather than merely to palliate, the evils of pauperism. The machinery devised at this time to carry out this policy was too imperfect to accomplish any great reform. Still it marked a beginning. In the year 1725 the number of poor under the care of each district visitor was limited to twenty-five. It is recorded that some good was accomplished in this way, but that public sentiment was not yet sufficiently educated to make the system successful. This lack was destined to be met in a measure at least by the influence of the humanitarian wave of the time which was shortly to make itself especially felt in Hamburg. The first result in Hamburg of this awakening interest was the organization of an institution for the care of the sick poor. The same humane spirit soon led many to visit the poor in a friendly manner, that they might make careful investiga-

been drawn freely from this source. See also C. R. Henderson, "Modern Methods of Charity," pp. 4-14 (1904).

[1] Joseph Henry Crooker, "Problems in American Society," p. 64 (1889).

tions into their condition. It is recorded that in this way, by an experience of several years, a large body of prominent citizens were both interested in the problem of pauperism and somewhat trained in actual work among the poor before any new organization was effected.

This experience and its lessons were set forth in 1786 by Professor J. G. Busch in a widely read popular weekly of the day. His insight into the nature of the difficulty of abolishing poverty is remarkable, especially for his day and generation. "I know well," he writes, "that it is enough to tell many just this fact. *It takes pains,* in order to relieve them of all serious thought of a fundamental improvement in our system of charity. But we must say this; and it is better that all recognize the fact than that they should still carelessly think that it is a simple matter, and amounts only to enforcing the old regulations in order to relieve the city at once of so great an evil." The growing interest in the poor among the public-spirited citizens of Hamburg led the next year to the re-organization of the system of poor relief. It was an elaboration of the germinal principle of *personal supervision by districts,* set forth in 1711.

It is recorded that in the working out of the organization of the new system, Professor Busch apparently furnished the personal leadership and enthusiasm while a leading Hamburg merchant, Casper Von Voght (1752-1839), furnished the organizing genius and administrative ability. The principles upon which they worked are as recorded by Crooker [1] are the following:

(1) "To create a central bureau to supervise all work for the poor, and to bring all charitable agencies under one management, in order to prevent 'overlapping,' and also to put a stop to indiscriminate almsgiving.

(2) "To subdivide the city into small districts, in each of which a competent citizen should personally investigate the condition of all paupers and semi-paupers, that

[1] See footnote to p. 18.

the exact needs of all might be known, that the deserving might be discovered and the undeserving rebuked, and that no more relief should be given than was absolutely necessary.

(3) "To remove the causes of distress and pauperism by compelling the able-bodied to work, by making the homes of the poor more healthy, by providing work for the unemployed and by giving an industrial training that they might grow up self-dependent citizens."

To put these principles into operation an Executive Board was organized, composed of five councilmen of the city, ten supervisors of the poor, chosen from the citizens at large, and the heads of departments, such as the church almoners, the director of the work-house, and the superintendent of the hospital. Those not ex-officio members of the board held office during good behavior or until they asked for release. The Executive Board had general management of all the charities of the city, it decided upon the disposition of all poor relief funds, and it made the rules and regulations which governed the conduct of those engaged in the friendly visitation of the poor. Below this Board were the visitors of the poor; of these there were three for each district of the city. These while working together took each especial care of his own group of needy people. They labored without pay, served for terms of three years, and were generally kept in office until they asked to be relieved. Von Voght's remark on this point is interesting: "The number of wealthy and respectable men who offered themselves for the severe task they were to undergo will forever furnish a bright page in the annals of civic virtue in Hamburg." [1] Each

[1] John Duncan in his book on "Collections relative to Systematic Relief of the Poor, at different periods and in different countries with observations on charity; its proper objects and conduct and its influence on the welfare of nations" (1815), says, p. 82, "Charitable institutions ought, indeed, to prosper in the city of Hamburg. There is so much morality amongst its inhabitants that for a time they paid their taxes into a sort of trunk, without any person seeing what they

district visitor was required to keep himself thoroughly informed respecting the condition of the poor under his care, of whom he kept a complete list. He was obliged to work according to certain printed instructions which, among other things, directed him to determine the sanitary condition of the dwellings occupied by the poor; the amount of rent charged and the sum due; the number, age, sex, physical condition, education and employment of the children; the character of the clothing and household utensils of the family; the source of support; the relatives and their ability to render assistance; the moral character and former habits of the parents; and, in fact, everything that enters into the social history and description of such individuals.

The sixty districts into which the city was divided were grouped into ten precincts, there being six districts with eighteen visitors in each. This method of organization afforded a channel of communication between the district visitors and the Executive Board. At the head of the work in each precinct, presided one of the ten citizens—supervisors, who were members of the Executive Board. The district visitor came into immediate contact with the poor, and reported their condition to the precinct superintendent or citizen supervisor, who, with the report before him ordinarily decided what course should be taken. In complicated cases he referred the report to the Executive Board, and awaited its decision. Except for cases of emergency the person who determined the relief given was not the person who came into immediate association with the poor. The decision of his superior, which was likely to be in the line of his own suggestion, the visitor carried into operation and reported results. It is of interest to note that these

brought; these taxes were to be proportioned to the fortune of each individual, and when the calculation was made they were always found to be scrupulously paid. Might we not believe, that we were relating a circumstance belonging to the Golden Age, if in that Golden Age there had been private riches and public taxes?"

citizen-supervisors at the head of the work in each precinct were obliged to follow certain established principles. Von Voght declared it essential in all relief:

(1) *To prevent any man from receiving a shilling which he was able to earn for himself.*

(2) To reduce the support given lower than what any industrious man or woman in such circumstances could earn; *for if the manner in which relief is given is not a spur to industry, it becomes undoubtedly a premium to sloth and profligacy.*

The spirit expressed in these lines as well as that expressed by Von Voght in his emphasis on the fact that comparatively few answers given by the needy are sincere reveal the advance made in the movement for organizing charity since his day.

In the carrying out of the general principles of Von Voght and his associates, it was soon found that additional machinery in the shape of auxiliary institutions was needed. One of these was a flax-yarn spinnery which served the purpose not only of affording employment to those out of work and of giving employment to all needy persons who received for any work which they were doing less than a bare living support, but also of teaching the unskilled the trade. At the end of three months these were dismissed with a spinning wheel and a pound of flax. The results of this experiment are of interest. "After three years, two thousand poor, who at the time they entered the school could do nothing at all, did earn from 18*d* to 20*d* a week, at such time and at such hours as were formerly quite lost to them; and the din of industry was heard where sloth or riot had inhabited before." The flax-yarn spinnery also served as a test for the so-called "work-shy," for it is recorded that for a certain period out of two hundred and seventy-six who applied for an allowance because they could find nothing to do, only forty accepted the work offered!

A hospital for incurables and those aged poor who were manifestly helpless was early established. Other medical needs of the poor were not overlooked. Provision was made to nurse "the deserving" in their own homes, the poor at reduced rates and the absolutely destitute, free.

The wisdom of these early pioneer social workers is seen in the emphasis they placed on the importance of "getting hold" of the child early enough. In the words of Von Voght: "*The most* effectual means of preventing misery is the better education of the children." It is surprising to note how many of their problems and attempts at solving them resemble those of a much later date. Families were kept together, if possible, by making small allowances for the care of young children; but if the ignorance or drunkenness of the parents endangered their welfare the children under six years of age were boarded out "in the houses of the better sort of poor." In every district a warm room was prepared and furnished with bread and milk, "where such parents as go out to work may deposit their children during the day, and thus prevent any obstacle to their own industry or that of their elder children." Reliance, however, was placed chiefly upon the free schools, which were provided upon a large scale for children between the ages of six and sixteen. Every poor family was compelled to send all children between these ages to these schools, where they labored two-thirds of the time and studied the elementary branches one-third of the time.[1]

It is not without interest to the student of the movement for the organization of charity to learn that the Executive Board of the Hamburg Institution encountered difficulty in securing the heart coöperation of some of the many private charitable foundations which abounded in that city in its attempt to prevent "overlapping" or, as it was then voiced, to prevent one person

[1] Joseph Henry Crooker, "Problems in American Society," p. 81.

receiving "two supports." In view of the question of finance ever present with the private charities of to-day it is of further interest to note the source of financial support then obtaining in Hamburg. It was both public and private as the following list of sources shows:

(a) Certain public taxes.
(b) One-half of what was collected in the church poor-boxes.
(c) A subscription taken up annually by prominent citizens among their neighbors.
(d) Weekly collections taken by the district visitors from house to house among those who did not make annual subscriptions.
(e) The contents of three thousand poor boxes kept in as many families, "in order that their children or their servants may have an opportunity of indulging their pity; and where, in the midst of conviviality, many a collection is made for the poor."

It is further remarkable to record that all the essential details of the foregoing plan of dealing with the poor were first carefully thought out and then inaugurated (1788) by the publication and wide circulation of bulletins or circulars of information and instruction which were put by the thousand into the hands of the general public. These circulars described in minute detail the whole system so that he who ran might read. It furthermore called upon the public to co-operate in making the plan a success. Such coöperation included the obeying of the municipal law forbidding almsgiving at the door or on the street, and the reporting of all cases of distress to the proper visitor.

It is of special interest to note that during the early years of the Hamburg experiment it was thought desirable to take three important additional steps.

(1) Free lodging houses for transients, who, after hav-

ing been given a thorough sanitary inspection, were at the end of three days sent out of the city or compelled to work.

(2) The appointment in 1797 of a special supervisor to secure as far as possible improved dwellings *"for the poor."* To aid his work in this direction, a "loan-fund" was created from which the poor could borrow money without interest, to be used in building houses, and to be paid back in small sums. The managers of the fund to accommodate the poor met on Sundays.

(3) The opening in 1801 of an infant school for the care and instruction of the very young children of the poor.

At the end of thirteen years, in 1801, the results accomplished by this Hamburg system of poor-relief were noteworthy.

"Beggary had been completely exterminated; a vast amount of terrible wretchedness had been relieved and much more prevented; many poor had been furnished work, and many had been taught a trade and made self-dependent; while in the free schools 'gentle means and perseverance got at last the better of a great part of the vices that grow in children who are trained up to beggary.' In 1788 there were 5,166 paupers in a terrible condition; in 1801 there were only 2,689, and these were in a comfortable condition. In 1788 there were 2,225 children paupers; in 1801 there were only 400 children paupers, and they were being cared for in homes or hospitals, or were being trained in schools. And the amount of money spent annually to give the poor this better care was really not nearly so large as the sum practically thrown away before 1788." [1]

In the stormy times from 1801 to 1825 the work was often interrupted and pauperism gained a new foothold in Hamburg. At length, the municipality was obliged to assume the entire expense of the system.

[1] Joseph H. Crooker, "Problems in American Society," p. 85.

It would seem that Von Voght travelled extensively for nearly two years in England and Scotland soon after the Hamburg system was started, and in these countries he made the acquaintance of many public-spirited citizens to whom he described the institution at Hamburg. *An Account of the Management of the Poor,* was printed in 1796 at London, and widely circulated.

"There is ample evidence," says Crooker, that this work "had a remarkable influence in Great Britain, and that it revolutionized public sentiment there upon the subject of poor-relief; while it did more than anything else to create that public opinion which led to the reform of the poor-laws in 1832." Malthus' *Essay on the Principle of Population* was first printed in 1798, two years after Von Voght's pamphlet was published. He refers to this pamphlet in words of highest praise, calling the Hamburg Institution "the most successful of any yet established." So great was the impression made by this pamphlet, and so high was the estimation in which it was held, that its re-publication was secured in 1817, by a committee chiefly composed of prominent merchants and business men of London. In their dedication the committee state: "The pamphlet contained such evidence of the benevolence and profound political wisdom of its author, and so much valuable information founded on experience that we were satisfied we could not render a more essential benefit to society, at the present crisis, than by reprinting and circulating it."

Crooker, to whom we are indebted for much of the foregoing account of the Hamburg system, believes that there is no doubt that Chalmers, of whose work among the poor of Glasgow, we shall presently speak, obtained from this source many valuable suggestions if not also much needed inspiration.[1]

Von Voght's influence was far-reaching on the continent as well. He is recorded as having travelled up and

[1] See pp. 33-38.

down Europe endeavoring to bring the charitable institutions of Vienna, Berlin, Paris and Marseilles into line with the Hamburg system. No less than twenty cities of Germany imitated the Hamburg experiment. One of these twenty German cities was Munich where Count Rumford in 1790, as we shall presently see, took vigorous steps to suppress vagrancy and to give a more efficient relief to the poor. It seems not at all unlikely that Count Rumford borrowed freely from the ideas already worked out in Hamburg by Von Voght.

The Contribution of Count Rumford

To recount the main incidents of the life of Benjamin Thompson, better known to the world under his Bavarian title of Count Rumford, would take us too far afield.[1] Born in the little town of Woburn, near Boston, Massachusetts, in the year 1753, the story of his life carries one to England, to Bavaria, again to England and finally to France. In 1784 he took up his residence in Munich where he was to hold many responsible official positions under the Elector of Bavaria. The Bavaria that Count Rumford first knew was in a sad condition; the country was poor, wasted by war and neglect; the army was corrupt and inefficient; schools were lacking; there were more convents than factories, and industry was not in high repute. Along the highways in the country almost every person one met on foot held out his hand for alms, while in the cities, "professional beggars invaded the churches and houses, and besieged the people in the street, exposing loathsome sores, and exciting pity by means of

[1] For further details of the interesting and varied career of Count Rumford see Ellis, "Life of Count Rumford," (1871); Edwin E. Slosson, "Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford," pp. 9-50, of *Leading American Men of Science*, edited by David Starr Jordan (1910); Elizabeth Gilman, "Count Rumford and his Work," *Charities Review*, Vol. VI, p. 218 (1897).

maimed and ill-used children." [1] The beggars not only begged but they extorted and stole from those whom they considered their lawful prey. Laws against them existed, as in most civilized communities, but the beggars were a law unto themselves. In the large towns, each one had his own district, in the possession of which it was not thought lawful to disturb him, and vacancies caused by deaths, removals or promotion were filled by rule.

In Munich there were 2,600 beggars or indigent persons out of a total population of but 60,000. The city which was overrun with a class of vagabonds whom the police were unable to control, was but typical of conditions generally. "The city government was taxed to its utmost to feed a pauper class which it had created, and to provide prisons for a criminal class which had grown out of the pauper, and the mendicant had become so bold, that the citizen from fear yielded to his demands.[2]

It did not take Count Rumford long to reach the conclusion that the then existing church, through its well intentioned but ill judged system of alms-giving, had raised up a pauper spirit which it could not lay.

It must be said to the credit of Count Rumford that instead of punishment or moral suasion, he recommended the improvement of conditions, first, by providing food and employment for every man, woman and child, on the theory that only when this is done can penalties against vagrancy be enforced. Accordingly, he began by establishing a House of Industry [3] in Munich, sheltered in a large and handsome building. Here work suited to the

[1] Edwin E. Slosson, "Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford," in *Leading American Men of Science,* edited by David Starr Jordan, p. 29 (1910).

[2] John Glenn, "Coöperation Against Beggary," *The Charities Review,* Vol. I, p. 70 (1891).

[3] It was called the "military workhouse" because it was a manufactory of clothing chiefly for the army and was under the control of the council of war.

capacity of all, from the aged and infirm to the youngest was to be provided with instruction if necessary. Payment was to be made in money for all work performed. The work was piece-work and those who earned the most during the week were to receive additional rewards Saturday evening so that there was to be every inducement for steady performance. A good free dinner was to be provided daily. The workrooms were large and commodious, well ventilated and lighted throughout and fitted up in the neatest and most comfortable manner, even to the point of elegance. In the passage leading to the paved court was an inscription in letters of gold upon a black ground, *"No alms will be received here."*

When all was prepared for his plan to rid the city of Munich of its beggars, Count Rumford was made head of the police of the city as their services were essential. He asked for the support of the Church and the priesthood placed itself at his side. He asked for the support of the citizens, and the citizens gladly responded by assisting him in person. The description of the putting of his program into operation cannot better be told than in Count Rumford's own words: "We were hardly got into the street, when we were accosted by a beggar who asked us for alms. I went up to him, and, laying my hand gently upon his shoulder, told him that thenceforward begging would not be permitted in Munich; that if he really stood in need of assistance (which would be immediately inquired into) the necessary assistance should certainly be given him, but that beggary was forbidden; and, if he was detected in it again, he would be severely punished. I then delivered him over to an order-sergeant. Having arrested the first beggar with his own hands, he requested the officers and magistrates to follow his example and to persuade others to do the same. These gentlemen consented. They dispersed to the different parts of the town, and, with the aid of the military, did their work so effectively that in less than one hour not a

beggar was to be found upon the streets. Those arrested were taken to the town hall, and their names and addresses taken, after which they were dismissed and told to return the next day to the new "military workhouse" where warm rooms, a good dinner and work for those who could perform it would be provided. A committee would be immediately formed to investigate their circumstances, and relief would be given to those unable to work." [1] Money was collected from all classes of the community for the relief of the indigent, by employment and alms. Count Rumford spared no pains in the administration of the House of Industry. He devised a system of keeping accounts very much like those now in use in modern factories. Every piece of yarn transferred from one room to another, every loaf of stale bread collected from the bakers, had to be duly recorded on printed blanks. To his credit it may be recorded that although handicapped by being compelled to start with so large a number of absolutely untrained work-people the experiment was successful financially as well as philanthropically, the workhouse soon becoming self-supporting. "The beggar before untaught and uncared for, accepted the idea of moral elevation and was transformed into a useful citizen, recognizing the possibility of self-support and realizing it." [2] In five years he practically abolished beggary in Bavaria.

It is interesting to note here the theory of philanthropy of one motivated by a hatred alike of idleness and waste who played so successfully the rôle of a benevolent despot. "When precepts fail," writes Count Rumford, "habits may sometimes be successful. To make vicious and abandoned people happy, it has generally been supposed, first, to make them virtuous. But why not reverse this order! Why not make them first *happy,* and then virtuous! If

[1] Elizabeth Gilman, "Count Rumford and his work," *Charities Review,* Vol. VI, p. 216 (1897).

[2] John Glenn, "Coöperation Against Beggary," *The Charities Review,* Vol. I, p. 70 (1891).

happiness and virtue be *inseparable,* the end will be as certainly obtained by the one method as by the other; and it is most undoubtedly much easier to contribute to the happiness and comfort of persons in a state of poverty and misery than by admonitions and punishment to reform their morals." [1]

In his wise handling of the problem of vagrancy, Count Rumford anticipated in many particulars, the best work that is being done to-day to solve that problem. In his insistence, in all charitable work, on a systematic assistance to self-support, strict bookkeeping and publicity of accounts, he anticipated the development of modern charity by almost a century, while "in the tact with which he secured the coöperation of the whole community, including the authorities of army, church and state, prominent citizens of the middle classes, and the poor themselves,[2] he has had unfortunately few imitators." [3] The influence of his work on the development of the charity organization in America has been both indirect and direct. Robert M. Hartley, the father of a movement resulting in the founding during the forties and fifties of associations for improving the condition of the poor,—forerunners of our present charity organization societies—writes with hearty approval of his methods of work,[4] while John Glenn of Baltimore, one of the pioneers of the American charity organization movement, was a careful student of Count Rumford's work in behalf of the poor of Munich.[5]

[1] Quoted by Edwin E. Slosson in his article on Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford, *See Leading American Men of Science,* edited by David Starr Jordan, p. 30.

[2] It is said that he took much satisfaction in telling that when he was dangerously sick in Munich he was awakened by hearing the confused noise of the prayers of a multitude of people who were passing in the street, and was told that it was the poor of Munich who were going to the church to put up public prayers for him, "a private person, a stranger, a Protestant."

[3] Edwin E. Slosson, "Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford," *See Leading American Men of Science,* edited by David Starr Jordan, p. 31.

[4] Memorial of Robert M. Hartley (1882), p. 377.

[5] Elizabeth Gilman, "Count Rumford and his Work," *Charities Review,* Vol. VI, p. 218 (1897).

The Contribution of Thomas Chalmers

Of the precursors of the charity organization movement few have had a greater influence than Thomas Chalmers—a pioneer in the ranks of the Protestant church in the field of scientific charity.[1] Born in 1790, educated for the ministry, he entered the service of the church where he soon gained distinction as an eloquent and powerful pulpit orator. The poor of Glasgow were clamoring at the time for the introduction of public outdoor relief. Believing that such relief served as an inducement for many to apply for aid who really did not need it, and that the "relief of the poor from public funds resulted in taking money from the thrifty and giving it to the thriftless," Chalmers opposed the popular demand. The meagre grants which such a fund could provide, he urged, inevitably were disappointing and led to grumbling and jealousy amongst the people. Chalmers lost his heroic fight[2] against the introduction of outdoor relief into Glasgow but succeeded in gaining permission to abolish it in the parish of St. John, which was especially created that he might try out his plan of doing without public outdoor relief. Those who lived in this parish, however, were still taxed for its maintenance elsewhere in the city.

The district, numbering 10,000 souls, was composed largely of working people, and was one of the poorest of the city. For this parish he proposed to take entire charge of all outdoor relief, meeting the expense by collections for the poor. He required charities of the city not to invade his domain. In turn, he agreed not to

[1] Edward T. Devine, commenting editorially in *The Survey* (October 28, 1911), on Chalmer's concept of an "invisible relief fund," writes that it "has been tested by experience; and has been a main factor on the economic side in the later development of the theory of charitable relief. It is a conception which, although not sufficient to account in full for the modern philanthropy, is yet one of its essential elements."

[2] Thomas Chalmers, "The Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns" (1821-1826).

send any applicant for relief to them. He divided his parish into twenty-five districts. A deacon was appointed to take charge of each district.[1] Whenever relief was asked for, investigation was made "to discriminate and beneficially assist the really necessitous and deserving poor, to diminish and ultimately extinguish pauperism, and to foster amongst the poor the habits of industry, providence, frugality, saving and honest desire to rise in the world, and simple dependence on their own exertions." [2] Every boy was to be taught to read, and every girl to sew.[3] In no instance was the visitor to give alms except in cases of extreme necessity. At all times, use was to be made of other means of relief besides money grants, such as eliciting the resources of the poor themselves.

Such was the wisdom and skill with which his whole scheme was carried out that all new cases of distress in his parish are said to have been cared for with about $400 a year, secured by Sunday evening collections for the poor. "In a population of ten thousand, but twenty new cases

[1] It will be noted that this assignment of a visitor to a district was not copied by American charity organization societies. In Boston, for example, the visitor was assigned to a family or families, and he kept up the personal relationship wherever they moved if practical.

The 10,000 persons of the parish apportioned to the 25 districts makes 400 per district. This means all, not the poor alone. In his book, "The Sufficiency of the Parochial System without a Poor Rate" (1841), Chalmers says that one visitor could take 300 families. This would be at least 900 to 1000 persons. It is evident that the relationship in such cases could not have been that implied in "friendly visiting," destined to be so much stressed by charity organization societies.

[2] In reference to the question of saving banks for the benefit of the poor, it is illuminating to read Chalmers' words. "An apprehension has been felt, in certain quarters, lest savings banks should arm the mechanic and workmen of our land with a dangerous power." See his "Christian and Civic Economy," ii, 233n; iii, 112; 265.

"The first savings bank of the modern self-sustaining type that was actually put into operation is credited to the Rev. Henry Duncan, who in 1810 established a 'parish bank' to relieve and prevent the poverty of his parishioners at Ruthwell in Dumfriesshire, Scotland." *The Survey*, October 7, 1916, p. 30, a résumé of an historical review of the rise and progress of savings banking by Edward L. Robinson.

[3] Thomas Chalmers, "The Sufficiency of the Parochial System without a Poor Rate" (1841).

rose in four years, of which five were the results of illegitimate births or family desertion, and two of disease. The cost of their relief was but $175 a year. In a few years the established pauperism of the parish sank from 64 to 99. . . ." [1]

The philosophy that underlies Chalmer's plan for the relief of distress is well expressed in the following words of Charles S. Loch, until recently the venerable general secretary of the London Charity Organization Society: "Society is a growing, self-supporting organism. It has with it, as between family and family, neighbor and neighbor, master and employé, endless links of sympathy and self-support. Poverty is not an absolute but a relative term. Naturally the members of one class help one another; the poor help the poor.

There is thus a large invisible fund available and constantly used by those who, by their proximity to one another, know best how to help. The philanthropist is an alien to this life around him. Moved by a sense of a contrast between his own lot, as he understands it, and the lot of those about him, whom he but little understands, he concludes that he should relieve them. But his gift, unless it be given in such a way as to promote this self-support, instead of awakening it, is really injurious. In the first place, by his interference he puts a check on the charitable resources of another class and lessens their social energy. What he gives they do not give, though they might do so. But next, he does more harm than this. He stimulates expectation, so that by a false arithmetic his gift of a few shillings seems to those who receive it and to those who hear of it a possible source of help in any difficulty. To them it represents a large command of means: and where one has received what, though it be little, is yet, relative to wage, a large sum to be acquired without labor, many will seek more, and

[1] D. O. Kellogg, "The Pauper Question," *Reports and Papers,* C. O. S. of New York City, No. 17, p. 16 (July, 1883).

with that object will waste their time and be put off their work, or even be tempted to lie and cheat. So social energy is diverted from its proper use. Alms thus given weakens social ties, diminishes the natural relief funds of mutual help, and beggars a neighbor, instead of benefiting him." [1]

It is no detraction from the credit due to Chalmers to point out that not all of his work was without precedent. His principle of dividing up a great city into what he called "manageable portions of civic territory" was not original, as we have seen. He drove home, however, with peculiar emphasis, both by precept and example the stimulating psychological effect of a job of manageable size. "There is a very great difference," writes Chalmers, "in respect to its practical influence between a task that is indefinite and a task that is clearly seen to be overtakable. The one has the effect to paralyze the other to quicken exertion." The genius of Chalmers is shown in the simplicity of the organization of his plan, in his belief in the inherent power of people to aid themselves, his emphasis on the importance of character in the poor,[2] in his emphasis on intercourse with the poor—doing things with them rather than for them—and in his protest against generalization without accurate observation. "Do not generalize except from facts accurately observed and carefully noted," warns Chalmers, time and again. "It is the besetting sin of the ardent philanthropist to generalize under the influence of an alarmist and over-heated imagination. Let us at least be definite." [3] Probably his genius is most definitely shown in his non-reliance on special relief schemes, due to his conviction that neighborly assistance, unlike relief from a precollected relief fund does not tend to atrophy the indi-

[1] The *Encyclopedia Britannica,* 11th edition, article on "Charity and Charities."

[2] C. S. Loch, "Poor Relief in Scotland," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (June, 1898), pp. 302-30.

[3] C. S. Loch, "Dr. Chalmers and Charity Organization," *Charity Organization Review,* August, 1897, p. 65.

vidual's will and ability to be self-supporting. "Such assistance as this," writes Dr. Devine, "has many advantages over that given by organized societies. There is little probability of imposition, of excessive relief, or of relief that is ill-adapted to its purpose, such as is common in the wholesale distribution made by public officials, and which sometimes shows itself in the work of private agencies." [1] Whether throwing the responsibility for relief entirely upon the resources of immediate neighbors is an adequate plan for other than homogenous communities, it has been generally recognized by leaders [2] in the ranks of charity organization, past and present, that "informal neighborly assistance is always to be given a liberal recognition" [3] as an element in the instinctive and unorganized methods by which every community distributes among its members the shock of unexpected want.

In view of all the foregoing it seems incredible that Chalmers' plan of meeting the problem of poverty in St. John's parish was destined to be abandoned. This, however, did not occur until 1837, fourteen years after its founder had removed to Edinburgh. The fact that those living in the parish were taxed for the maintenance of public outdoor relief elsewhere is doubtless one of the reasons for the abandonment of the plan. There appear to have been more immediate reasons, however, which are probably sufficient in themselves to explain it. There

[1] Edward T. Devine, "Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes," *Charities Review,* Vol. X, p. 230 (1900).

[2] See Mrs. Charles Russell Lowell, "Duties of Friendly Visitors."

Dr. Devine believes the conception of Dr. Chalmers on which the parochial system of St. John's, Glasgow, was founded is one of the "essential elements" of modern philanthropy—see editorial under caption, "Social Forces," in *The Survey,* for October 28, 1911.

Mrs. John M. Glenn believes his "principles sound and enduring. Society failed because it was not yet ripe for his noble ideal of a world without a pauper."—"He placed his principles in clear light, urged them with persuasive eloquence, demonstrated their value by the scientific process of verification, and by costly and self-sacrificing experiment." From an unpublished address.

[3] Edward T. Devine, "Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes," *Charities Review,* Vol. X, p. 230 (1900).

was first the disruption of the church. Chalmers' scheme of charity largely depended on the church having an accepted relation to all the people of the parish.[1] Moreover the new Scotch poor-law hampered his work.

Though Chalmers' experiment came to an end, the influence of many of his ideas has lived on. The majority of the principles and methods that have been referred to as characterizing his genius have since been incorporated into the body of principles of charity organization.[2]

The Contribution of Frederick Ozanam and Sylvain Bailly

In 1833 a young and zealous Catholic student of law at the Sorbonne in Paris, in order to meet the criticisms of the followers of the French reformer, St. Simon, that the Catholic Church really did nothing for the poor, persuaded seven of his companions to organize for the more effectual aid of the needy. This little band of eight undergraduates, with Ozanam as their leader, met in the back room of a printing office in Paris and organized the first conference of St. Vincent de Paul. It would not be correct to suppose that when Ozanam arranged with his companions to meet weekly for the practice of good works he had conceived the plan of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul as it subsequently developed.[3] Nevertheless it

[1] C. S. Loch, "Poor Relief in Scotland," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, June, 1898, pp. 302-30.

[2] C. S. Loch writes in 1910 under the caption, "Progress of Thought in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries," in his book, "Charity and Social Life," p. 345; "But perhaps, in regard to charity in Great Britain, the most important change has been the revival of the teaching of Dr. Chalmers (1780-1847), who (1819) introduced a system of parochial charity at St. John's, Glasgow, on independent lines, consistent with the best traditions of the Scottish Church."

[3] John Rochford, "Frederick Ozanam," pp. 19 and 20 (1913), "So far was this from being the fact, that when one of the members proposed a friend for admission to the Conference," writes the author, "the strongest objections were made to allowing any one else to intrude within the circle of intimate friends of which the Conference was comprised. Eventually, however, they gave way and admitted the

was to these efforts of Frederick Ozanam to show the reality of his Christian faith that the Society of St. Vincent de Paul owes its birth.

While the suggestion which led to organization of the first conference came from Ozanam, it is likely that the method and spirit of the society came from Père Bailly, a journalist who befriended them and gave them not only the use of his printing shop for their meeting, but also many helpful suggestions.[1-2] By the skeptical, Ozanam and his companions were asked: "But what do you hope to do? You are only eight poor young men and you expect to relieve the misery that abounds in a city like Paris! Why, if you counted any number of members you could do but comparatively nothing." [1] It was true that they had but little money and their collections at their meetings amounted to but a few sous. Père Bailly reminded them, however, that there was something worth even more to the poor, namely, that moral assistance which they could give. "If you intend the work to be really efficacious, if you are in earnest about serving the poor as well as yourselves," wrote their councillor, "you

proposed candidate. Other admissions soon followed, so that by August the Conference included about fifteen members." *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[1] See "The Letters of Frederick Ozanam," translated by Ainslie Coates, Chapter V (1886). Bailly was first president of the Council-General, serving for 11 years. His successor speaks of him as founder, moderator, and father of the society. See p. 277, "Manual of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul," edition 1909, Paris.

[2] Bougand in his "History of St. Vincent de Paul," p. 211, says the Society of St. Vincent de Paul "is sometimes thought a birth of our day, but is in reality a revival of this great movement of charity." Bailly in a circular of December, 1842, writes: "You are aware that those thoughts are taken from the most intimate writings of St. Vincent de Paul, from the rules which he laid after many years' experience, for the blessed works that he had instituted, and to secure their increase and duration," p. 252, "Manual of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul," edition 1909, Paris. It is of interest to note in this connection that some of the young men who comprised the first conference of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul went to the well-known Sister of Charity (Rosalie Rendu), who instructed them "in visiting the poor." See "The Letters of Frederick Ozanam," translated by Ainslie Coates, Chapter V (1886).

[3] "Lettres de Frédéric Ozanam," 1831-1853, Tome Premier septième édition (1891), p. 76.

must not let it be a mere doling out of alms, bringing your pittance of money or food; you must make it a medium of moral assistance, you must give them the alms of good advice." [1] He suggested to his young friends that much could be done to remedy misery and distress "by placing their education, their intelligence, their special knowledge of law and science, and their general knowledge of life at the disposal of the poor; that instead of only taking them some little material relief, they should strive to win their confidence, learn all about their affairs, and then see how they could best help them to help themselves. 'Most of you are studying to be lawyers,' he said, 'some to be doctors, etc. Go and help the poor, each in your special line; let your studies be of use to others as well as to yourselves; it is a good and easy way of commencing your apostolate as Christians in the world.' " [2]

The disciples soon caught the spirit of their friend and guide. They visited the poor in their own houses, each member visiting two or three families a week. Receiving-places were established for old clothes, old furniture, etc. Medical services were given where needed. Work was procured for those who had none. "The members interested themselves in all classes of the poor and miserable, from the infants in crêches to the condemned to death in the prisons; and they followed the funerals of those who died. . . . In fact, the whole extent of the needs of the poor seems to have been in a measure considered by this association, either from its first beginnings or later." [3] Bearing in mind the teaching of Père Bailly and the spirit with which Ozanam organized the new society, it is not surprising that in so doing he discour-

[1] *Charities,* Vol. III, p. 17 (1899).

[2] Kathleen O'Meara, "Life and Works of Frederick Ozanam," quoted by Locke, Jesse Albert, "Frederic Ozanam," *Charities Review,* Vol. IX, p. 74 (1899).

[3] "The Letters of Frederick Ozanam," translated by Ainslie Coates, Chapter V (1886).

aged indiscriminate giving and insisted upon an investigation of all cases, and that "friendly visiting" was made the cornerstone of the new society; moral uplifting and encouragement to self-help having first place,—alms-giving being secondary. He took his stand on the universal nature of charity; there was to be no religious test in the distribution of alms to those in need.

In a letter written in 1834, one year after the founding of the new society, Ozanam declared that he longed "to see all young men who have intelligence and heart united in some scheme of charity, that thus a vast and generous association for the relief of the poorer classes might be formed all over the country." [1] Twenty years after the establishment of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, its founder said with his dying breath: "Instead of eight visitors, we have grown to two thousand in Paris alone and we visit there five thousand families." [2] This meant that they were reaching probably 20,000 individuals—over one-fourth of all the poor of the city. There were five hundred conferences in France, and the movement had spread into England, Spain, Belgium, and even Jerusalem.[3]

The rules of the Society to-day, which are practically the same as those adopted by the first conference established by Ozanam in 1833, throw much light on the methods and purposes of the society. "Red-tape-ism" is avoided as much as possible, but certain fundamental rules are to govern. Thus, expenditures are for relief only, and the relief is to be given promptly and from funds voted by the conference only, not from the visitor's own purse. These funds are to be collected secretly

[1] "Lettres de Frédéric Ozanam," 1831-1853, Tome Premier septième édition (1891), pp. 114, 115.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

[3] In 1914 there were 6,000 conferences of this same society, scattered throughout all quarters of the globe, with one hundred thousand active and one hundred thousand honorary members. The figures are an estimate. See "Report of the Superior Council of New York to the Council-General in Paris," for the year 1914, p. 90 (1915).

from its members and no one himself in need is to be a member. Visits are to be made in the home. The visitors are to go in couples. The number of families to each two visitors is not limited. It is usually governed by the number of families to be cared for and the number of members connected with the respective conferences. There is a register of poor which contains detailed information from each member. Records of all families visited are kept exclusively for the information of the members of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, no publicity being given to the conditions of the poor who may be in need of the assistance of the society.[1]

The attitude of mind with which visitors are enjoined to approach their work is so excellently revealed in the following words of Ozanam that they are quoted in full:

"Help is humiliating when it appeals to men from below, taking heed of their material wants only, paying attention but to those of the flesh, to the cry of hunger and cold, to what excites pity, to what one succors even in the beast. It humiliates when there is no reciprocity, when you give the poor man nothing but bread or clothes or a bundle of straw; what, in fact, there is no likelihood of his ever giving you in return. But it honors, when it appeals to him from above, when it occupies itself with his soul, with his religious, moral and political education, with all that emancipates him from his passions and from a portion of his wants, with those things that make him free and make him great. Help honors when to the bread that nourishes, it adds the visit that consoles, the advice that enlightens; the friendly shake of the hand that lifts up the sinking courage; when it treats the poor man with respect, not only as an equal but a superior since he is capable of suffering what we perhaps are incapable of suffering, since he is the messenger of

[1] The registering of cases with a social service exchange (see p. 113) is viewed as a violation of this rule of the society and so is not practiced.

God to us, sent to prove our justice and our charity and to save us by our works. Help then becomes honorable, but it may become mutual, because every man who gives a kind word of advice, a consolation to-day may, to-morrow, stand himself in need of a kind word, advice and consolation; because the hand that you clasp, clasps yours in return; because that indigent family you love, loves you in return and will have largely acquitted themselves toward you when the old men, the mothers and the little children shall have prayed for you." [1]

One cannot understand the essential nature of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul without realizing that the purpose is not chiefly charitable but "the sanctification of its members." [2] Although no work of charity is foreign to the society, especially its avowed object of visiting the poor, it is clear that "to unite in a communion of prayers" is equally, if not even more the object of the society.[3] The foregoing did not, however, prevent Ozanam and Bailly (nor their followers to-day) from doing much unselfish work in the interest of others.

As in the case of other pioneers in the field of philanthropy, the work of Ozanam and Bailly was destined to influence the subsequent expression of the charitable spirit of the age.[4] The emphasis placed by charity organizationists on friendly visiting received encourage-

[1] Frederic Ozanam. "Words of the Wise," *Charities,* Vol. III, p. 17 (1899).

[2] See 2d and 5th paragraphs of explanatory notes under Article I, and the first under Article II of "Manual of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul."

[3] See explanatory notes on both Articles I and II of the Manual.

The following are the objects of a St. Vincent de Paul conference as stated by the Superior Council of New York: "First, to sustain its members by mutual example in the practice of a Christian life; second, to visit the poor in their dwellings, relieving their temporal wants and affording them religious consolation; third, to teach catechism to the children of the poor; fourth, to foster the forms of charitable works springing from these." See "Instructions for Forming Conferences, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, Superior Council of New York (1911), p. 3.

[4] "The Life of Frederic Ozanam," by Kathleen O'Meara, is among the works of pioneers mentioned by Gurteen in his "Handbook of Charity Organization," the first book published dealing with the charity organization movement in the United States (1882).

ment from the success which attended this phase of Ozanam's and Bailly's work [1] while the use of a district conference to guide and help friendly visitors, a plan emphasized by all the pioneer charity organization societies, doubtless found its prototype in the "conferences" of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul.[2]

The Contribution of the Elberfeld System

Although 1853 is the date popularly associated with the establishment of the "Elberfeld system," the work launched that year was but a renaissance of a similar movement begun over fifty years earlier.

"The care of the poor in Elberfeld," writes Herr Ernst, one-time president of the board of charities of that city, "was until 1800 chiefly under the control of the church. At that time a board of charity was formed among the citizens independent of the church, in order to check the increasing beggary! Each of the three parishes chose two citizens, and these six constituted this civil board of charity. These divided the work among themselves, and settled all questions in common, one of the members presiding. Beggary and giving at the door

[1] It should be recalled in this connection that a conference of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul was established in New York City as early as 1846. By 1876 there were 204 Conferences under the Council of New York.

In a paper on "District Conferences," in which the writer, Mrs. James T. Fields, one of the pioneers of the Boston Associated Charities, emphasized the value of "visitors" in the work of charity organization, it is stated that many suggestions in charity organization have been derived from the St. Vincent de Paul Society, *Reports and Papers,* C. O. S. of N. Y. (May, 1882), No. 3, p. 1.

Writing in 1886 on "What Shall We do for the Poor," D. O. Kellogg, another of the early leaders, acknowledges the debt of charity organization societies to Sylvan Bailly, of Paris, along with other predecessors, without the combined labors of whom "Charity Organization now would be impracticable." *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. I, p. 18 (1886).

[2] Writing in 1880, Robert Treat Paine, Jr., President of the Associated Charities of Boston, said: "The Catholics claim, I think with justice, that the credit is due their admirable society of St. Vincent de Paul, of making the counsels of a conference an important agency in deciding what families to aid, and how much and what kind of relief to give." *Jour. Social Science* No. XII, p. 106 (December, 1880).

were forbidden. And, instead, every citizen was made to contribute to this new organization. These contributions were collected monthly by the citizens in turn. . . . In 1801, the number of supervisors was increased to twelve; and it was decided to separate the function of district visitation from that of supervision. The city was divided into eight precincts, and each precinct into four districts. One of the twelve supervisors was put over each precinct, and an overseer over each district. The overseers had to investigate and report; but they had no control over the final disposition of cases, which was made by the board of supervisors, under the Burgomaster as president." [1]

It is apparent from the records of this organization that they had become acquainted with the Hamburg experiment already discussed in this study.[2]

Although this system remained unchanged until 1853, its administration, it would seem, was neither wise nor efficient. Its fundamental principle had been tested by experience. Its application suffered in this instance from insufficient membership to carry it out. In 1853 a reorganization of the system was effected, largely under the leadership of Daniel von der Heydt.[3] It was not an abandonment of the former policy but rather a more satisfactory application of the original ideas underlying the experiment of 1801. The machinery of administration was simplified, thus obviating much harmful friction and discord. The city was districted. A citizen visitor

[1] See Joseph Henry Crooker, "Problems in American Society," pp. 100, 101.

[2] Joseph Henry Crooker in his "Problems in American Society" records the fact that when they considered the question how they could most easily obtain adequate information in regard to the entire management of paupers, they were astonished to find in the Hamburg records a circular of instruction which they made their own with a few unimportant changes.

[3] It was by Daniel von der Heydt, David Peters and Gustav Schliefer by whom this reorganization "was thought out and carried through to success." "The Elberfeld Semi-Centennial," *Charities*, Vol. XI, p. 460 (1903). It is of interest to note in passing that von der Heydt had been influenced by Chalmer's work in Glasgow.

or Armenpfleger was placed in charge of each district. Appointed for a period of compulsory service the Armenpfleger became the responsible person upon whose services the municipality could count. The new regulations provided that each visitor should have charge of not over four needy families. The city was redistricted whenever the number of poor in any district increased or decreased to any considerable extent. The visitors, chosen from all walks of life, received applications for aid directly from those needing help. They were required to visit each poor family and thereafter to inquire into its circumstances at least once in every two weeks. The law fixed a minimum amount for relief, and any income received by the family from any source was deducted from such minimum. The Armenpfleger also acted as a "friendly visitor," in so far as he assisted by advice, by the finding of employment, or by the provision of medical aid, any person or family whose circumstances would seem to indicate the possibility of future dependence.

Conferences of groups of these citizen visitors were held for mutual consultation and education. Supervision for the purpose of standardization was secured by requiring the Armenpfleger of a group of districts to report at regular fortnightly meetings to an overseer. The decisions of these meetings were reviewed immediately by a central committee. Thus while the relief of the poor in their homes was decided and administered by the Armenpfleger in their joint meeting, it was always subject to supervision and review.

There is thus a distinct difference between the Armenpfleger and the friendly visitor of the charity organization society. The "Armenpfleger" is essentially a public official or a "volunteer official." "He comes as a friend, a neighbor and a fellow citizen, concerned to get" a necessitous family "over their trouble in the best possible way." But on his other side, the voluntary helper is the agent

of the public authority, registering his cases in the official records, reporting what he has seen, carrying out in his ministrations the official instructions which he has received, procuring admission for his families to the several public institutions, dispensing as outdoor relief the funds provided by the local authority out of rates and taxes, and acting throughout under the constant supervision and direction of the expert municipal officials in each department." [1] It should be noted that unlike the volunteer or friendly visitor of the charity organization society, when the Armenpfleger enters a home to make inquiries, he is armed with authority as well as with the power of sympathy. Among other differences is the geographical assignment of families, a system that did not take root in the United States.

The new plan met with phenomenal success. In 1852, the year before von der Heydt's plan was formed, the city, with a population of fifty thousand, had four thousand paupers. In 1869 the population was seventy-one thousand and the paupers one thousand and sixty-two, while the expense had dwindled one-half.[2] The introduction of the system reduced the cost of relief from 178,645 to 90,083 marks, or 1.78 marks per head. In 1885-6 the cost was 159,750 marks for a population of 106,700 or 1.50 marks per head.[3] By 1904 the population had increased to one hundred and sixty-two thousand, and the proportion of the population in receipt of temporary or permanent relief had diminished by over forty per cent since the introduction of the system; that is from 8 to

[1] Sidney Webb, "The Extension Ladder Theory of the Relation between Voluntary Philanthropy and State or Municipal Action," *The Survey*, March 7, 1914, p. 706.

[2] D. O. Kellogg, "The Pauper Question," see *Repts. and Papers*, C. O. S. of N. Y., No. 17, p. 13 (July, 1883).

Although it is not clear whether the term pauper is used in a technical sense of meaning one dependent upon the public purse, the decrease is shown by the figures quoted is significant.

[3] C. S. Loch, "Report on Elberfeld System," p. 66.

4.7 per cent. The per capita cost had also diminished It is therefore fair to say that within a short time de pendence on public funds in part or in full for suppor in Elberfeld was reduced to very narrow limits.

The important characteristics of the system whic achieved these results and which became with variation in detail, the standard method of poor relief in German are: First and foremost, individualization in the care o the poor. The subdivision of the field of work is carrie so far that each overseer has a small enough number o cases to make relatively efficient individual work possible Second, emphasis on cure rather than palliation. Third in matters of technique, verification of facts, writte records and comparative statistics are accepted as indis pensable. The fourth characteristic, perhaps the mos striking, at least to Americans, is the principle of civi obligation.[1]

On the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of th Elberfeld system it was recorded: "The duties o the citizen of Elberfeld as a visitor are considere the highest honors. To-day every citizen of Elber feld is gladly ready to take this responsibility, and i he once takes it, he finds in it every satisfaction, an remains faithful."[2] Considerable prestige attaches t the office of Armenpfleger, which is considered the firs round on the ladder of municipal honor offices. Th 'honor board' of Armenpfleger at the time of the semi centennial contained one hundred and ten names of citi zens of all positions who had been twenty-five years an upward in the service of the poor law administration This situation in which both law and custom impos

[1] "The really distinctive feature of the Elberfeld system and the o to which its excellence is due, however," writes Sidney Webb, "is n this obligation of service, which is seldom enforced, but the organi relationship in which the voluntary helper stands with regard to th public authority." Sidney Webb, "The Extension Ladder Theory o the Relationship between Voluntary Philanthropy and State or Mu nicipal Action," *The Survey,* March 7, 1914, p. 706.

[2] "The Elberfeld Semi-Centennial," *Charities,* Vol. XI, p. 460 (1903)

o great duties on the great mass of the citizens is ltogether unparalleled in England and America.[1] This loes not mean that the Elberfeld experience has been vithout influence either in England or America.[2]

English Pioneers of Philanthropy

A review of the foreign antecedents of the charity rganization movement in the United States carries one inally to England, the home of the first society for or- anizing charity in the world. The methods of this so- iety launched in London in 1869 embody not only much f the experience and many of the practices already dis- ussed in this chapter, but also much native wisdom gained by a first hand contact with the problem of pov- rty extending back a half century and over.

As early as 1796 Thomas Bernard,[3] assisted by the

[1] For this among other reasons Charles S. Loch in a study of the Elberfeld system concludes that such a system would be more successful n Germany than in England though he admits that "in towns which ontain a stationary industrial population, in which there is no great everance of the rich and poor, and where there is a good burgher spirit, t might succeed, though probably rather as a communal administration f voluntary relief and endowments than as an outdoor relief system." Certainly there is reasonable ground for doubt as to whether a system of ompulsory visiting of the poor such as the Elberfeld system contem- lates, and which is indigenous to the bureaucratic soil of Germany would ucceed equally well after transplanting to America with its heterogeneous roups in every large center of population and its traditions against all hat savors of bureaucracy. C. S. Loch, "Report on Elberfeld System."

[2] C. S. Loch, "Charity and Social Life," p. 345.

Robert M. Hartley, the father of the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor Movement of the 1840's seems to have received nore of his ideas from Germany than England.

Charles G. Ames, who introduced the first charity organization so- iety into America (see pp. 175-177), "was influenced by the Elberfeld ystem of 'organizing charity' for Germantown during the winter of 872." From a letter from (Mrs. Charles G.) Fanny B. Ames to he author under date of August 23, 1914.

[3] Sir Thomas Bernard was born of a good family and educated in New Jersey, before and at the time of the War of Independence; he eturned to England when scarcely more than a boy; gave himself to trenuous study of the law. . . ." He was successful and retired and efore he was fifty selected philanthropy as a profession. Says B.

Bishop of Durham, M. Eliot, William Wilberforce and others, founded in London, "The Society for Bettering Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor." Its objects were "to make inquiry into all that concerns the poor, and the promotion of their happiness a science." [1] Thomas Bernard, the moving spirit of the society believed that one's duty to the poor is a personal service. He considered that the poor had never had a fair trial, that experiments had been made for their advantage which had not been explained to them and of which they had been not unnaturally jealous, and that the best means to counteract the idleness and drunkenness of which they were so widely accused was to provide them with better food and better lodging.[2] He was especially interested in Count Rumford's cooking stoves, and in the question of cheap associated housekeeping. Meantime, in a scientific spirit, the new society proposed to collect information concerning the charitable efforts already in existence and to see how they could be improved and extended.

In 1805 another step toward scientific charity was taken in England when the London Mendicancy Society was organized. The new organization "was not formed for the purpose of collecting money to be distributed indiscriminately to any applicants, whom subscribers, anxious to be rid of importunity, might send to the office; but for the purpose of suppressing that swarm of audacious imposters which had formerly made this city (London) the subject of a contemptuous proverb: and for the further purpose of assisting those who should be

Kirkman Gray of him: "To him we owe the attempt to take stock of philanthropy; and if large acquaintance with its working be a qualification he possessed it, for none is before him in the promotion of works of charity. Others had collected information—he did so as part of his philosophical aim." B. Kirkman Gray, "A History of English Philanthropy," p. 278 (1905).

[1] From the "Preliminary Address to the Public."

[2] M. E. Jersey, "Charity a Hundred Years Ago." *The Nineteenth Century*, Vol. 57, p. 656 (1905).

desirous of affording aid to real distress." [1] This latter the society proposed doing by offering the time and labor of the members of the committee to the public to explore "the retreats of the humble, the inobtrusive, the friendless, the helpless and the hopeless" [2] and to conduct such investigations as occasion in each case demanded. It is interesting to note that while the society recognized the fact that "the coöperation of the benevolent, both in the labor of investigating and in relieving the distresses of the indigent, is at all times desirable" [3] and to this end sought the increase in its numbers, it nevertheless recognized the fact that "the various occupations and engagements of most persons prevent them from engaging in such inquiry, and system and habit can alone induce correctness in this as in other exertions." [4] While thus standing for a more or less professional attitude toward the relief of distress, the society at the same time declared that although it was willing to become the almoner of others, it was "not anxious to become the sole distributor of charity." [5]

In 1813 a similar society was established in Edinburgh, with sub-committees for investigation, for employment, for education, and for the supply of food. The Edinburgh Society for the Suppression of Mendicity, as it was called, so successfully operated a self-sustaining savings bank that, in 1817, Parliament took under government regulation the rapidly multiplying savings banks in the United Kingdom. The society's third annual report, wrote Mr. C. S. Loch almost a century later, contains passages "that might almost occur in the annual report of any society of the present day." [6]

No account of the contributions of the English pio-

[1] John Duncan, "Collections on Charity," pp. 185, 186 (1815).
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 186.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 186.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 186.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 186.
[6] *Charities*, Vol. IX, p. 132 (1902).

neers of the earlier years of the century is complete without reference to William Allen and Elizabeth Fry. Encouraged by the Society of Friends, these two early took up the struggle for better methods of dealing with the pauper and criminal classes. Their work among the convicts of Newgate, their attempts to relieve by national legislation the distress bequeathed the English people by the wars with Napoleon, and their organization of societies for the systematic visiting of the poor constitute notable beginnings in a wiser handling of the problems of crime and poverty.

In 1843 there was founded in London The Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association. Its funds were distributed entirely through the local clergy and their district visitors. Beside this society and The Strangers' Friend Society, founded in 1785 as a relief society primarily for the benefit of those not entitled to parochial relief, there were in London a number of smaller relief societies confining their operations to certain districts in the Metropolis, and which antedated the founding of the London Society for Organizing Charity.

In 1844 a movement for improving housing conditions was launched in London with the organization of the Society for Improving the Condition of the Laboring Classes, of which Lord Shaftesbury was chairman. In 1856 Miss Burdett-Coutts was building in Bethnal Green; in 1862 Mr. Peabody established a fund of £150,000 in trust for the same purpose; while in 1864 Miss Octavia Hill, whose influence on the charity organization movement on both sides of the Atlantic is marked, began her work.[1] By 1868 the interest in housing had reached such proportions that there were at least eight associations interested in this much needed reform.

[1] Bosanquet, Helen, "Social Work in London," p. 16 (1914). See also "Life of Octavia Hill," as told in her Letters, edited by C. Edmund Maurice (1913).

The London Charity Organization Society

The first charity organization society in the world was launched in London, England, the 22d day of April, 1869.[1]

The immediate cause of this new attempt to deal with the age-old problem of pauperism and poverty was the East End distress in London of the latter sixties, due in part to the industrial effect in England of the American Civil War. By 1869 certain boards of guardians were sitting under police protection, besieged by threatening crowds of the poor and distressed. The poor rates were going up by leaps and bounds. In the city of London, between the years 1860 and 1869, the number of persons annually supported or assisted by official charity alone, increased from 85,000 to 120,000; and the annual official expenditure increased proportionately from four millions to seven millions of dollars![2] In addition vast sums of private benevolence were being spent to little purpose. Instead of wisdom and caution in the field of voluntary enterprise, there was prodigality, disregard of economic laws, impotency and confusion. An age in which the two richest nations of the world were doubling their accumu-

[1] For a detailed account of many preliminary steps taken between June 22, 1868, when the Reverend Henry Solly, a Unitarian minister, read a paper entitled, "How to Deal with the Unemployed Poor of London, and with its 'Roughs' and Criminal Classes" before the Society of Arts which resulted in the formation of the Charity Organization Society; and April 22, 1869, see Helen Bosanquet, "Social Work in London," pp. 17-27; H. Holman writes in the *Charity Organization Review,* new series, Vol. XXXII, p. 23 (1912) under the caption, "First Principles of Charity Organization," "The C. O. S. was brought into being in 1869, by a desire to prevent crime, through training and finding employment for those likely to become criminals—'the destitute and truant poor.' This idea was quickly modified into 'the prevention of pauperism and crime'—which recognizes the chief cause of disease. The idea of the method of prevention was enlarged so as to include 'the coöperation of existing charitable agencies, official and private.'" (See W. M. Wilkinson's 'History of the Origin of the C. O. S.')

[2] S. H. Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," p. 23 (1882).

lating wealth every twenty years had become lavish of alms, and in this soil had sprung up "a race of charity-mongers with canvassing books, most of whom were free to apply their easily-gotten subscriptions according to their own judgment or caprice." [1] To make the picture of the charitable situation more dark it was the belief in many quarters that even the administration of the emergency funds raised in London for the relief of the Lancashire weavers had miscarried. Every one was agreed that immediate action was necessary.[2] The result was the launching of "The London Society for Organizing Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicancy" (popularly known as the Charity Organization Society), already referred to.

The more remote causes of the new movement lay in the English system of poor relief. The Poor-Law Amendment Act or reform of 1834 required among other things that the local administrators of the law erect a work-house or work-houses for their respective districts or poor-law unions. The "work-house test" was reëstablished by directing that no relief should be given to able-bodied persons, emphasis being laid upon the principle "that the condition of the pauper ought to be, on the whole, less eligible than that of the independent laborer." [3] "The framers of the poor law of 1834 never seriously considered how they could find work for the destitute. They only wanted a disagreeable and deterrent *occupation*. Their principle was to offer board and lodging in the work-house to all who would take it; the only further consideration being how to make the recipient's condition so uncomfortable that he would avoid it as long as he could, and get out of it on the first opportunity." [4] Pos-

[1] D. O. Kellogg, "The Function of Charity Organization," Lend-a-Hand, Vol. I, p. 451 (1886).

[2] See H. Holman, "First Principles of Charity Organization," *Charity Organization Review*, new series, Vol. XXXII, p. 24 (1912).

[3] "Letters and other Writings of Edward Denison," edited by Sir Baldwyn Leighton, pp. 114, 115 (1872).

[4] *Ibid.*

sibly it was felt in some quarters that "this system, thoroughly and universally enforced by able administrators, would have stamped out pauperism altogether, to the infinite advantage of the whole laboring class." [1] But the law never was in harmony with public opinion; it was very partially and negligently executed and broke down.[2] Some of the effects of the breakdown have already been noted in the statistics quoted above of the unprecedented increase in the numbers in London receiving public assistance.

The relative success of the charity organization movement in England in face of great odds cannot be understood unless one appreciates the rôle played by the ancient universities of England in the social thought of last century. In no part of England did the problem of poverty attract greater attention or receive fuller discussion than at the two great Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and at the University of London. They were among the first of the more prominent centers of thought to grasp the important bearings of the questions involved. By the 50's knowledge of the social misery in London had been brought to these seats of learning and had awakened their conscience. Three men of the church often heard at Oxford were Charles Kingsley, Frederick Denison Maurice and Frederick William Robertson, a younger man and less well known, but a profound student. By the end of the decade graduates who came from the University to London frequently placed their free time at the disposal of Workingmen's College, which had been founded in London in 1854 by Maurice. Social reform and kindred subjects were in the air in class-room and on the campus. Statesmen, clergymen, philanthropists and educators studied the problem from their respective standpoints. The influence of the Universities in the social awakening is to be appre-

[1] "Letters and other Writings of Edward Denison," edited by Sir Baldwyn Leighton, pp. 114, 115 (1872).
[2] *Ibid.*

ciated in part at the mention of the names John Ruskin, Dr. Thomas Arnold, and Professor T. H. Green at Oxford and of Dr. Whewall, one of the most profound thinkers of his time, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. As a result of the influence of these noted thinkers, Oxford and Cambridge enthusiasts, who had been anxiously awaiting a practical solution of the great social problems of the day would, on leaving the University, settle among the poor. The all-too-brief career of Edward Denison, an Oxford man, son of a bishop of the Church of England, is but one illustration of many that might be cited of young University men who, at that time, gave themselves as well as their money to the work of practical social reform.

The new society was fortunate in the calibre of many of the men and women who formed its personnel. These included, among others, the then Earl of Shaftesbury, the then Duke of Norfolk, Sir Charles E. Trevelyan, Charles Bosanquet, the then Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, the then Archbishop of Westminster, the then Lord Bishop of London, Alsagar Hay Hill (brother of Miss Octavia Hill), John Ruskin, Cardinal Newman and William E. Gladstone.[1] "Among its most active members were some of the leading physicians of England. These gentlemen had come to the conclusion that a dispensary or hospital conducted on the traditional system of indiscriminate gratuitous relief, could only become, to hundreds of thousands of honest people, a vast *school of pauperism*—demoralizing the honest poor, educating them in improvident and mendicant habits, and teaching them, in one most vital department of life, to be thriftless and dependent."[2] One of the greatest assets of the new society seems to have been its great influential and vig-

[1] Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, series 5, number 8, Appendix, pp. 322 and 323. Cardinal Newman and William E. Gladstone are mentioned as among those who "took hold of the work of building up the society."

[2] S. H. Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," p. 99 (1882).

orous executive council, with Lord Lichfield at its head.[1]

If the new movement was fortunate in the personnel of its founders, it was even more fortunate in the fund of information and experience upon which it could draw.[2] In addition to the common fund of knowledge already discussed, especially the work of Chalmers, it had a living touch with the work of Octavia Hill and a vital contact with the wealth of experience of Edward Denison. Miss Hill's interest in the poor of London was well known at the time. Knowledge of her experiments in improving the housing conditions of the poor was attracting attention far and wide.[3] The very year of the founding of the new society she read a paper before the Social Science Association of London on the "Importance of aiding the poor without alms-giving," in which she expressed a firm belief in personal and sympathetic intercourse with the poor in small local effort in working with the poor rather than great centralized schemes, and a desire that the giving of money dissociated from real sympathy be checked by the reformers of charity. Through her writings and service in both district work and on the Central Council of the Charity Organization Society, she had a marked influence by her wise counselling during the formative years of the new society. "Let us never," she maintained in reason and out, "weakly plead that what

[1] S. Humphreys Gurteen, "Beginnings of Charity Organization in America," Lend-a-Hand, Vol. XIII, p. 354 (1894).

[2] It is not without interest to students of the American movement to record that the year that witnessed the launching of the London C. O. S. also marked the completion of the Boston Charity Building, and that the London society gave "handsome recognition of what had been accomplished at the head of Massachusetts Bay." D. O. Kellogg, "The Function of Charity Organization," Lend-a-Hand, Vol. I, p. 450 (1886).

[3] It was Mr. Ruskin who enabled Octavia Hill to carry into effect her plan for the elevation of the poor through purchasing condemned houses and, after making them sanitary, renting them to the poor. "He at once came forward," she writes, "with all the money necessary and took the whole risk of the undertaking upon himself. He showed me, however, that it would be far more useful if it could be made to pay; that a working-man ought to be able to pay for his own house." See "Homes of the London Poor," Reprint No. 8 of the N. Y. State Charities Aid Association (1875), p. 6.

we do is benevolent; we must ascertain that it is really beneficent too."

Although Edward Denison had little to do with the formal organization of the Charity Organization Society, no one had more to do with shaping its ideals.[1] He, with Sir Charles Trevelyan, contributed a larger experience and a clearer conception of what was needed in the organizing of the society than probably any other man of the time. Denison first came into direct contact with the poor of London as an almoner of the Society for the Relief of Distress. While a visitor for this society he wrote to a friend that he saw how perfectly useless were doles of bread and meat.[2] "All the men," he wrote a little later, "who really give themselves most trouble about the poor are the most alive to the terrible evils of the so-called charity which pours money into the haunts of misery and vice every winter."[3] Perceiving the unsatisfactory results of giving relief by doles, he determined to attempt some more thorough and drastic treatment. It was at this time (1867) that he took up his residence among the poor of Stepney district, one of those great London wastes of humanity of that day, that he might familiarize himself with its ways of life and habits of thought. He soon began the work of developing night classes, schools, workingmen's institutes and sanitary reforms. His work in Stepney district and his knowledge of the experience of Octavia Hill in her work with her poor tenants soon led him to see the dangers of material gifts to the distressed from any source. Denison's philosophy was essentially that of self-help. "No man," he wrote, "may deliver his brother, he can but throw him a plank."[4] This plank, as he used the term, was the "alms of good

[1] M. E. Richmond, "What is Charity Organization?" *Charities Review*, Vol. IX, p. 492 (1900).

[2] See "Letters and other writings of Edward Denison," edited by Sir Baldwyn Leighton, pp. 20, 21 (1872).

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 58, 59.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

advice" of which Sylvain Bailly had spoken in counseling Ozanam and his fellows. "How many thousands of paupers," writes Denison elsewhere, "have lived and died, and been buried at public expense, whom a little friendly advice, a little search for friends or relations, some pains taken to find proper work, when the first application to the board (of Poor-Law guardians) was made, would have lifted out of the mire and set on the rock of honest industry." [1] Above all, Denison believed that certain definite social reforms were necessary before much headway could be made against the rising tide of poverty. In 1866 he had written when still a visitor for the Society for the Relief of Distress, "the chief use of this Society and of many others in my view consists in bringing a considerable number of persons belonging to the upper classes in actual contact with the misery of their fellow citizens and so convincing them of the necessity of social reform." [2] His social reforms included a radical change from the prevailing Lady Bountiful type of charity with its doles to the poor; a revolution in the administration of the Poor Law; Housing and Sanitary Reforms and a wide diffusion of education among the masses. Denison's untimely death occurred in 1870, when the new society was still less than a year old.

The new society began without funds and without District Committees but with "a clear idea of what it hoped to achieve." [3] Its plans included beside the organization of a Central Committee, the establishment of District Committees in all parts of London to organize the vast chaos of charitable administration and relief in their respective districts. The relief to be organized was not only of large and well established relief societies

[1] M. E. Richmond, "What is Charity Organization?" *Charities Review*, Vol. IX, p. 498 (1900).

[2] See "Letters and other writings of Edward Denison," edited by Sir Baldwyn Leighton, p. 21 (1872).

[3] "The C. O. S. in its Infancy," *The Charity Organization Review*, new series, Vol. 33, p. 183 (1913).

such as the Society for the Relief of Distress,[1] The Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Society and the Strangers' Friend, but also the relief of some very extensive but still local organizations for relief such as the South London Refuge and Mission, and the East End Relief and Mission Fund. In brief, the District Committees were to serve as clearing houses for the charity of their respective jurisdictions. In the main, the organizing of relief for the vast amount of distress which did not come under the direct action of the Poor-Law officials was to be the chief concern of the Committees, but it was proposed that the Committees should also be in communication with the Poor-Law officials in order that the overlapping of relief should be avoided wherever possible, for it was evident closer coöperation between the public authorities and the private charities had become indispensable.

The new society clearly conceived its purpose to be "to give a definite aim to and to direct into the most effective channels the large amount of benevolent force at work in England and particularly in London." Its object was the organization of relief rather than its creation. It based its justification for being on its opportunity of promoting the real efficiency of all other societies. It was to be a rival of none.

"The new organization believed as earnestly as Denison did in developing all possible substitutes for relief, but it found another and more immediately pressing task thrust upon it. Substitutes for relief could gain no foothold so long as relief itself in larger quantities continued to be poured out, without plan or purpose or inter-communication, by agencies both religious and secular, both public and private.[2]

[1] The members of the Society for Relief of Distress, "the true pioneers of the movement," heartily coöperated with the new society. See footnote p. vii, "Letters and other Writings of Edward Denison," edited by Sir Baldwyn Leighton (1872).

[2] M. E. Richmond, "What is Charity Organization?" *Charities Review*, p. 492 (1900).

It seems fair to say that the charity organization movement came as a protest to the grave abuses of charitable relief then obtaining. Viewed as a needed reform, it came as part of the gradual reaction against the failure of the Poor-Law reform of 1834 rather than as a distinct and radical departure from the previous methods of handling the problem of poverty. "It arose primarily," writes Dr. Peixotto, "to point out the futility of the numberless casual private societies which the boundless fertility of the philanthropic imagination had, especially during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, brought into existence."[1]

In time the movement became more and more the outward expression of a new school of charitable thought and endeavor founded by Denison and his friends. They visualized a philanthropy controlled by citizens "acting with more 'heart'—for which read patience, insight, initiative—than the government, and more circumspection than private societies or individuals have traditionally been wont to show."[2] It must ever be borne in mind in interpreting the London pioneers in charity organization that the Manchester School of Political Economy, which maintained that nothing should be done for the poor that would tend to make their lot "better than the poorest independent laborer," swayed the minds of the English intellectuals. It permeated the philosophy of Denison's generation. The doctrine of laissez-faire was widely recognized as a most important economic principle. "Success denoted strength, fitness, righteousness. The individual causes of distress and poverty were emphasized and discussed." [3] These facts should be recalled, as every institution reflects the conditions of its birth and the

[1] Jessica B. Peixotto, "Reconciling Public and Private Relief." The Second Annual Report of the Municipal Charities Commission, City of Los Angeles, Cal., p. 28 (1915).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[3] Robert Hunter, "The Relation between Social Settlements and Charity Organization," *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. XI, p. 75 (1902).

atmosphere in which it develops. They affected the London Society in its formative years. These facts are not here recited as a criticism of those who launched the charity organization movement, which was assuredly in many ways a step in advance beyond what mankind had previously taken, but rather as an aid in grasping the significance of the change that has come about in the social thinking of leaders in the movement during the past forty years.

Of all the antecedents of the charity organization movement in the United States, none has had a greater influence than the work of these pioneers of England just reviewed. The first charity organization society to cover a large American city (Buffalo) was transplanted direct from England.[1] But of even greater importance was the influence of the work and writings of Edward Denison and Octavia Hill, from whom the spirit of the work in America, especially Boston and New York, received great impetus.

Did space permit, it would be interesting to trace the evolution of the charity organization movement in England since the pioneer days just described, but as inviting as the excursion would be, it would take us too far afield.[2]

[1] "The gradual unfolding of the charity organization scheme as it became developed in practice," writes S. H. Gurteen, one of the group of Oxford students referred to before in the text and later founder of the Buffalo Charity Organization Society, "was watched by many a University graduate with the keenest interest, and not a few became active members of committees or in other ways lent their aid to insure the success of the scheme." It was in this way, by actual voluntary participation in the work, and through the training of the district office, and district committee room that "the 'University Slummers,' as they were called (and I am proud to have been one of them), came to appreciate both the theoretical perfection of the underlying aim, idea or scope of the society, and the practical wisdom of its methods." S. H. Gurteen, "Beginning of Charity Organization in America," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. XIII, p. 355 (1894).

[2] The subsequent development of the movements in the two countries presents some interesting contrasts. The English movement has been based in the main on the Manchesterian School of Economics with its emphasis —modern emphasis—on *laissez-faire.* In America, on the other hand, the emphasis has been on an increase in government activity or at least social control through legislation. The American viewpoint has

been increasingly social which, in recent times, has been finding an outlet in legislation. An example of this is the tenement house legislation in New York, in the main the result of efforts of Charity Organizationists. In England the general social conditions to be faced have differed fundamentally from those in America. In the first place, the composition of the group that the charity organization societies of the two countries have had to deal with present important differences. The English societies have accepted the presence of an hereditarily poor class, a class that is static. In America there is too much hope and progressiveness in the atmosphere even of the poor, for such a static condition to endure. The American poor are a dynamic group, nor is the immigrant often found in the pauper class. The universal testimony is that they rise in the social and economic scale with great rapidity. Even among those in America, either native or immigrant, who are forced over the poverty line, one seldom finds the same name long remaining on the records of the charity organization society. A further fundamental difference exists in the matter of giving relief. The English societies are largely relief agencies, while in America the tendency has been to remain societies for *organizing* charity.

Perhaps the chief difference between the *London* and *American* attitude is that in London they "consider the situation of many families or persons as not helpable through charitable means." they therefore refer them to the Poor Law which through the workhouse, boarding of children, etc., can supply relief and a new environment. London, however, is changing and adopting the American standards in this matter.

For a history of the London Charity Organization Society, see Helen Bosanquet, "Social Work in London," 1869-1912: "A History of the Charity Organization Society" (1914).

CHAPTER III

ANTECEDENTS OF THE MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

If it is true to-day that the more enlightened care of the needy and the prevention of ills are not matters which as yet press heavily upon the personal comfort and interest of most men, one can readily understand why in 1776 and for long thereafter in a country with an abundance of free land and with conditions of life comparatively simple, there was no need of societies for organizing charity. Communities were so small as to allow men to be neighbors. To see that the destitute did not suffer for shelter, food and fuel, to watch with the ill, was natural and neighborly. The "invisible relief fund" of Chalmers was available in every community. As each occasion arose, the resources of the neighborhood were organized to meet the need,—as is still done in rural communities to-day,—successfully often, but failing when the problem requires expert knowledge. As Warner has pointed out, our resources seemed to be inexhaustible. "Least of all, was it imagined that we need give serious attention to the matter of poor-relief. It was assumed that we were quarantined against poverty and distress by our glorious Constitution and Declaration of Independence."[1]

This does not mean that there was a complete absence of either private or public charitable agencies.[2] There

[1] Amos G. Warner, "American Charities," revised edition, p. 18 (1908).

[2] At the beginning of the nineteenth century almshouses were to be found in the larger cities of New York, Boston and Philadelphia, while the older states of Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Connecticut and Rhode Island had each of them, apparently, a

were sporadic private agencies existing from very early days. These usually restricted their activities to a narrow field as a particular nationality or class of needs. One of the earliest of the former recorded is the Scots Charitable Society in Boston, organized in 1657.

"Perhaps the earliest Protestant church charity which became permanent is the Boston 'Quarterly Charity Lecture,' founded in 1720 by a few persons, who held quarterly meetings on Sunday evenings for benevolent purposes, at which some member was invited to preach.[1] On March 6, 1720, Cotton Mather gave the first of these lectures of which there is record. The meeting is now held annually. The collections made at this lecture and the income from two endowed funds, yielding from $1,500 to $1,800 annually, are distributed equally to four Congregational churches, who dispense them according to the prevailing custom of the charitable organization of each church."[2]

Besides the Scotch society, there gradually came into existence a number of like societies for other nationalities. Most of them continue to exist to the present day. Among the earlier ones to be organized were the St. Andrew's Society of New York in 1756; the German Society of New York in 1784; the St. Andrew's Society of Baltimore in 1806; the French Benevolent Society of New York in 1809; and the German Society of Baltimore in 1817.[3]

Of the type of society existing in the eighteenth cen-

well developed system of county almshouses. The above named cities were the first to have almshouses. The one in Philadelphia was completed in 1731, while the one in Boston was opened almost seventy years earlier. See Robert W. Hebberd, "Institutional Care of Destitute Adults," *Charities Review,* Vol. X, p. 515.

[1] Chapter on "Charities of Boston," by George Silsbee Hale, in "Memorial History of Boston," p. 660 (1881).

[2] E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," p. 325 (1905).

[3] Other prominent societies of this kind formed after those named in the text but antedating the first charity organization society include: the German Society in Boston (1847); Illinois St. Andrew Society, incorporated in 1853; and the French Benevolent Society of Baltimore, organized in 1854.

tury based on meeting a special need, the four following are illustrative: The Philadelphia Society for alleviating the miseries of public prisoners formed in 1787; the Massachusetts Charitable Fire Society (incorporated in 1794, "for the purpose of relieving such as suffer by fire, and of stimulating genius to useful discoveries, tending to secure the lives and property of their fellow men from destruction by that element"); The New York Dispensary, organized in 1791, for the care of the sick poor of the city, and in the same city The Society for the Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children, founded in 1798. This last type of philanthropic organization continued to multiply during the first quarter of the next century[1] They have never ceased coming into existence, but for the period here under review they were the predominant type of charitable effort.[2]

The first society to attack the problem of destitution generally, and so to become the forerunner of the A. I. C. P.[3] of the 40's, the immediate predecessor of the C. O. S.[4] of the 70's, was the New York Society for the Prevention of Pauperism formed in 1817.[5] This was the outcome of the interest of a group of men in

[1] Many of the eleven soup houses existing in Philadelphia in 1900 date back almost a century. The "Fragment Society" of Boston, designed "to assist in clothing the destitute, more especially children," was organized in 1815. The Widows' Society in Boston was started in 1816, and in the year following there was organized the Boston Fatherless and Widows' society, both intended primarily for Protestants. The records of the Widows' Society of Hartford, Connecticut, date from 1825. These are illustrative of others.

[2] Of this period of our history Weyl writes: "A man of leisure would rather have become Director of a local Charitable Society—which brought social prestige—than be Supervisor of Highways or School Commissioner." W. E. Weyl, *The New Democracy*, p. 56.

[3] A. I. C. P. means Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor.

[4] C. O. S. means Charity Organization Society. These abbreviations are so useful and have become so popular that they will be used frequently in this study.

[5] Of existing agencies dating from this period mention should be made of the Union Benevolent Association of Philadelphia, established in 1830, to encourage industry, to suppress pauperism and to relieve suffering among "the worthy poor."

New York, some of them Friends, who associated together o devise means of lessening pauperism. They corre-ponded with Edward Livingston in New Orleans and William Roscoe in England. A study was made of exist-ng conditions at home, including records of the courts, n which the district attorney coöperated. The annual eports of this society for the years from 1818 to 1824 numerated the following as causes of pauperism: 1, gnorance; 2, idleness; 3, intemperance; 4, want of conomy; 5, imprudent and hasty marriages; 6, lotteries; 7, pawnbrokers; 8, houses of ill-fame; 9, gambling ouses; and 10, the numerous charitable institutions of he city.

Of the remedies suggested many were far-reaching and dvanced for the time. It was proposed to divide the ity into small districts, each district to have two or three vorkers to visit the indigent. It further proposed to pro-note savings banks,[1] benefit societies, and life insurance; o prevent the access of paupers who have not gained a ettlement; to procure an entire prohibition of street eggars; to aid in giving employment to those who can ot procure it, by establishing houses of employment, or y supplying materials for domestic labor; to promote unday schools; to devise a plan by which all spontaneous harities may flow into one channel; to procure the aboli-ion of the great number of shops in which spirituous iquors are sold by license. The managers recommended he practice of abstaining from giving money to beggars, vho usually appropriate what they get to increase the rofits and the business of the dram seller.[2]

In short, the society laid down "a program of reform nd educational improvement such as was scarcely to be

[1] It was in 1816 that Philadelphia established its Savings Fund ociety, the pioneer of the country. The Bank of Savings in the ity of New York was projected that year but did not open for usiness until three years later.

[2] Fourth annual report of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism n the city of New York, 1821.

surpassed later by the associations for improving the condition of the poor and the charity organization societies." [1] Unfortunately, however, the society appears never to have put many of its recommendations into practice. It reported on the penitentiary system of the United States; it studied especially the causes of juvenile delinquency. Then centering its work on the care of youthful offenders, it became finally, in 1824, the board of managers of the House of Refuge for New York male juvenile offenders.

The spirit of inquiry into the causes of pauperism was in the air, and, furthermore, not confined to New York City. In 1821 appeared the Quincy Report on the pauper laws of Massachusetts, dealing with conditions in that commonwealth. The report reached five conclusions, of which two have especial interest for us. First conclusion: "That of all modes of providing for the poor, the most wasteful, the most expensive, and most injurious to their morals and destructive to their industrious habits is that of supply in their own families." Fifth conclusion: "That of all causes of pauperism, intemperance in the use of spirituous liquors is the most powerful and universal." [2]

Of greater interest than the Quincy Report was the report made in 1824 by J. V. N. Yates, Secretary of State, to the New York Legislature. The general conclusions are illuminating:

1. That the existing laws led to litigation of the most expensive and hurtful kind, exhausting nearly one-ninth of the funds intended for the relief of the poor, and leading to harsh removals of many human beings, like felons, from no other fault than poverty.

2. That the poor when farmed out or sold were frequently treated with barbarity and neglect.

[1] E. T. Devine, "Relief and Care of the Poor in their Homes." *Charities Review*, Vol. X, No. 3, p. 128 (1900).

[2] Josiah Quincy, "Report on the Pauper Laws of Massachusetts" (1821), now very rare; its text, however, is reprinted from a copy in the Boston Public Library in *Charities*, Vol. III, No. 18, pp. 2-7 (1899).

3. The education and morals of the children of paupers (except in almshouses) were almost wholly neglected. They grew up in filth, idleness, ignorance and disease, and many became early candidates for the prison or the grave. The evidence on this head was regarded as too voluminous even for reference.

4. There was no adequate provision for the employment of the poor throughout the state. Idleness very generally generates vice, dissipation, disease and crime.

5. The poor laws had come to encourage the sturdy beggar and profligate vagrant. Overseers not infrequently granted relief without sufficient examination into the circumstances or the ability of the party claiming it.

6. The laws also held out encouragement to the successful practice of street beggary.

7. Idiots and lunatics did not receive sufficient care and attention in the towns where no suitable asylums for their reception are established.[1]

"There are three ways of dealing with the poor," wrote the author of this report, "one, to farm them out to contractors; another, to relieve them at their homes; the third, to sell them at auction" (i.e., a public bidding at which he who offered to support them at the lowest price became their keeper). This he refers to as "a species of economy much boasted of by our town officers and purchasers of paupers." Yates saw no reason for pride in this; neither did he subscribe to the plea of "many men of great minds, that distress and poverty multiply in proportion to the efforts made to relieve them, wherefore the whole subject had better be let alone." To meet the situation as he found it, the author of the inquiry submitted "a fourth way, a poor-house plan which he submitted with illustrations, as it were, this among others from the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism: 'The stepping-mill is highly recommended for vagrants, street

[1] J. V. N. Yates, "Report of the Secretary of State in 1824 on the Relief and Settlement of the Poor," reprinted in the 34th Annual Report of the State Board of Charities of the State of New York (1900), Vol. I, pp. 939-963.

beggars, and criminals.' "[1] When we reflect on the conditions which made this report possible there is a strong inclination to criticize our forefathers for the neglect of preventive social work, but we must expect our descendants to reprove us justly for much that we are leaving undone, especially when they consider the brighter light in which we see things.

The Contribution of Joseph Tuckerman

In every community there are certain forward-looking and far-sighted individuals who are at least a generation ahead of their time, and whose constructive proposals have to await a later day before bearing fruit. Of such was Joseph Tuckerman, a pioneer in the field of American philanthropy, whose work merits more than passing notice at this point. A new era of charity began in Boston in 1826 as an outgrowth of the Unitarian movement under the leadership of William Ellery Channing. By 1834 Channing's journals "testified to this direction of his interest. 'Causes of poverty to be traced,' he writes. 'Is not the social order wrong?' 'Let the poor be my end.' And again, in more formal phrase, he writes, 'Were I, on visiting a strange country, to see a vast majority of the people maimed, crippled and bereft of sight, and were I told that the social order required this mutilation, I should say, 'Perish this order!' Such was the fruitful seed scattered over the field of philanthropy by this epoch-making man." [2] Of the small circle of thoughtful men and women of whom he was the center, was Joseph Tuckerman, classmate and intimate friend, and first "minister-at-large" under the American Unitarian Association. Born in Boston in 1778, graduated from Harvard College in 1798, he entered the

[1] Jacob A. Riis, "A Modern St. George," *Scribners' Magazine,* Vol. L, p. 385 (October, 1911).

[2] Francis G. Peabody, "Unitarianism and Philanthropy," *Charities Review,* Vol. V, p. 26 (1895).

ministry. After twenty-five years of parish life, he turned to the work of a city missionary among the Boston poor, wisely giving it the title, not of a mission, but of a "ministry-at-large." [1] He read of the working of the Poor Law in England, of church and private charity in Scotland; he found out what was going on in the other states of the Union; he was one of a commission appointed by the House of Representatives of Massachusetts in 1832 to report on the care of paupers in the state, and as agent of the commission visited many towns. In the same year the "Visitor of the Poor,"[2] by Baron De Gerando translated by two Boston women, was published in Boston, with an introduction by Tuckerman. This was one of the earliest contributions in this country to the literature on charity. De Gerando spoke of him this high praise as a charity worker, "Joseph Tuckerman knows the difference between pauperism and poverty."

Believing it the part of wisdom to bring others together either to increase their personal intercourse with the poor, or to confer on what they had learned through such intercourse, he organized in 1832 a company of visitors to the poor, and in October, 1833, he brought about a union of the ministers-at-large of *all denominations* for purposes of consultation and mutual helpfulness. This led in the spring of 1834 to the Association of Delegates from the Benevolent Societies of Boston, of which Dr. Tuckerman wrote the first report the year following. The objects set forth resemble closely those of the Associated Charities of Boston, organized forty-five years later.[3]

It is interesting to note in passing that Yates' report to the New York legislature in 1824 had stated that the

[1] Tuckerman urged that to secure the proper influence of a minister-at-large, the services were required of not less than four Protestants and one from the Catholic Church. "Elevation of the Poor," p. 59 (1874). Boston was then a city of about 60,000.

[2] "Le Visiteur du Pauvre," by Joseph Marie De Gerando, translated by Mrs. Horace Mann and Miss Peabody (1832).

[3] Miss Zilpha D. Smith, first General Secretary of the Boston Associated Charities, believes that the objects of this Association were drawn up without reference to the by-laws of the former organization.

families assisted as outdoor poor are reported by the commissioners to be composed chiefly of Irish immigrants as are also the vagrants sent to the Bridewell and penitentiary.[1] Tuckerman in like vein speaks of the influx of poor and ignorant foreigners as one of the discouragements to effective charity. For this reason he urged steps to prevent the accumulation of the foreign poor in the city. The Society for the Prevention of Pauperism of Boston (later known as the Industrial Aid Society) was established (1835) in direct response to the appeals and suggestions made by Dr. Tuckerman, and in 1851 the Boston Provident Association was established, following the example given in New York by the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor.

For the seven years of his ministry-at-large, Tuckerman worked actively in public institutions and in the homes of the poor. These years of service undermined his health; and after six more years of lingering invalidism, he died in 1840. Although others of course were studying the problem of destitution and publishing the results of such studies, they were less influential. Tuckerman was clearly a forerunner and prophet of the movement for the organization of charity. Speaking of Tuckerman's six years of service as minister-at-large, Francis G. Peabody says in language which is hardly too extravagant, "This very brief and inconspicuous undertaking . . . must always remain the starting point for any history of scientific charity in this country." [2]

One must turn to reports of Tuckerman, made frequently to the clergymen and laymen of Boston interested in the ministry-at-large, to appreciate the breadth of view and deep insight into the problem of poverty that characterized the man. His reports cover a wide range of fundamental questions, such as the public relief of the poor; intellectually and morally neglected children;

[1] J. V. N. Yates, "Report to Legislature of New York," quoted above.
[1] Francis G. Peabody, "Unitarianism and Philanthropy," *The Charities Review,* Vol. V, p. 29.

wages paid the poor; the means most effectual for relieving the wants of the poor; and the need of compulsory attendance at school.

"In his intimate acquaintance with the poor, and direct and frequent intercourse with them, Dr. Tuckerman has the following fact most forcibly presented and impressed upon him, and he repeatedly *urges* it upon our consideration; namely, the *inadequacy* of the wages paid to a large class of the poor to supply even the bare necessities of life and *the frequent occurrence* of periods, even of months together, during which numbers, and even large numbers, in our cities find it impossible to procure any employment whatever by which to keep themselves from destitution and suffering."[1]

Tuckerman's own words[2] are of interest on this point. "I am sure that there are great numbers of the poor who now cannot subsist without the occasional assistance of benevolent societies, or of benevolent individuals, who would yet most gladly, if they could do it, support themselves by their own labor; and who would never ask for charity if the wages of six days' labor would meet the necessities of the week." . . . "I have known women, indeed, to be glad to get pantaloons to make for six and a quarter cents per pair, who could not, however, by their best industry, make more than two pairs in a day. How, then, are they to pay their rent, and to obtain fuel and food?" That Tuckerman had broken entirely with the simple philosophy of "Lady Bountiful" is further seen when he characterizes as "important" and "deserving of attention" a communication which he had received from a committee appointed by the citizens of Philadelphia, "to learn what is the effect upon the comfort and morals of the females who depend on their work for a support, of

[1] The italics are the editor's. Editor's note preceding Part II, on "The Wages given to the Poor" (p. 79), of Joseph Tuckerman's "On the Elevation of the Poor," edited in 1874 by Edward Everett Hale, who brought together selections from Tuckerman's reports to form this little volume.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

the low rate of wages paid to that class of society;—to what extent the sufferings of the poor are attributable to those low wages;—and what is the effect of benevolent, or of assistance societies on the industry of the laboring poor?" [1] He believed the doctrine that there must be everywhere, and especially in large cities, a certain amount of poverty and crime to be as false as it was vague[2] and that the evils of poverty grew out of the character of the more prosperous classes as well as of the poor.[3]

Dr. Tuckerman's reports dwelt on almost every aspect of charity work which has since grown of importance. He called attention to the need of improved dwellings for the poor, half a century before this modern enterprise was undertaken. He anticipates the congestion of life in our great cities, and calls for more attractive rural homes. He discerns the radical importance of the child-problem, and sets it by itself as a special form of charity. He sees that the secret of judicious charity is in obtaining as perfect a knowledge as may be of all within and without the individual in a deep respect for every human being and in the continuous visitation of individuals by individuals.[4] He has no technique of inquiry but he has the aim, and he has already learned that when one *knows*, one sees, both what is to be done, and the resources for accomplishing it, and that the individual may be brought to coöperate only on the basis of this knowledge. He expressly advises a bureau of registration for the common use of the overseers of the poor and the benevolent societies, "that there shall be *a discrimination in the distribution of alms by our charitable societies.*" [5] He

[1] Editor's note preceding Part II, on "The Wages given to the Poor" (p. 79), of Joseph Tuckerman's "On the Elevation of the Poor," edited in 1874 by Edward Everett Hale, who brought together selections from Tuckerman's reports to form this little volume, p. 80.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 123. Apparently he would agree with Muirhead, "The Starting Point of Poor Law Reform" (1910), pp. 88-9.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 40-44.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 90.

estimates that such a measure would give voluntary societies thirty-three and one-third per cent additional value for their funds. He thus becomes the father of the idea of a Social Service Exchange, an agency destined decades later to be adopted by charity organization societies. His most detailed report, written as agent of a State Commission, is devoted to the general subject of municipal relief; and in it he advocates with a radicalism which for his time Peabody [1] characterizes as "amazing," the total repeal of the Poor Law system of that period, tests of work for the able-bodied, houses of industry worthy of the name for the more incapable, and the reference of all temporary poverty to private relief.

His attitude toward "soup-houses" is interesting, especially in view of their long continued use in some places, notably Philadelphia. In one of his reports he says, "Establishments of this kind are well known in Europe, and they have been adopted in some cities in our own country in times of great distress among the poor. . . . But I have little doubt whether they are means of increasing the pauperism of a city." [2]

Of even greater interest to those who would put social work to-day on a higher professional plane is the importance that he attached to employing in all philanthropic work, not the cheapest men, but men of the highest ability and character and wisdom, men able to add important contributions to the current knowledge of the causes and character of poverty, and the most effective means of its *prevention*.[3]

Of the greatest interest possibly is his belief that in spite of all the misery of his day and of the recognized complexity of social problems, a way out could be found.

[1] Francis G. Peabody, "Unitarianism and Philanthropy," *The Charities Review*, Vol. V, p. 27 (1895).

[2] Joseph Tuckerman, "On the Elevation of the Poor" (editor's title), edited by Edward Everett Hale (1874), p. 86. For a brief account of the origin of soup-houses, see B. Kirkman Gray, "A History of English Philanthropy," pp. 257-260 (1905).

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 51-57.

If even a few of our most intelligent and philanthropic men, he urges, will study these subjects by an extensive personal communication with the poor, and the criminal, will meet weekly to bring together their facts and compare opinions, occasionally publishing these;[1] and when they shall see clearly what is needed, combine their efforts for the suppression of one and now another of the springs of evil—and for the promotion of establishments of good, a great and glorious reform might be effected.[2] To-day in district conferences of the charity organization society, in city conferences as well as in the state and national conferences are being worked out Tuckerman's principle that if people come to know the poor, and confer together about their problems, they shall find the way out—the various ways out.

It is but conservative to say that no single forerunner of the charity organization movement in America contributed more to its aims and methods than did Joseph Tuckerman. Certain it is that he was the first American not only to distinguish between pauperism and poverty but to advocate consistently the abolition of outdoor relief, the coöperation of all forces working on charitable problems, the principle of the registration bureau, and personal visitation, or friendly visiting, all chief articles of the new creed of charity.

The "A. I. C. P." Movement

One cannot study this period of the history of charitable effort without seeing the effects in America of the economic changes going on in England and Ireland. With the application of steam to manufacture in England, with the triumph of the factory over domestic production, with

[1] "I would place the services which the minister may perform by the communications he may make respecting poverty and the poor to the more favored classes; by the influence he may exert in calling forth kindly and Christian sentiments in these classes toward each other; and by the aid he may give in the various measures, both private and public, which may be taken either for the remedy or the prevention of pauperism and crime." *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 125.

the far-reaching social dislocations that these changes brought in their train, the great swarming western migration began. At the time of which we are now writing "the 'foreign element' were like an army encamped in the midst of New York." [1] This city, "like every other great and populous city," writes a contemporary observer, "is largely overrun with an army of beggars of both sexes, representing all ages and nationalities." [2] The facilities for moving the newcomers inland were entirely inadequate, and an increasing number of destitute immigrants were stranded in the seaport town. New York, while the gateway of America, was not the only city facing this problem. We have already noted Tuckerman's comment on the situation. In 1835, Senior, writing about the provisions for the poor and the condition of the laboring classes in America, says: "Either an increase of the evils of pauperism, or a clearer perception of them, has induced most of the states during the last ten years to make both in their laws for the relief of the poor and in the administration of those laws changes of great importance. They consist principally in endeavoring to avoid giving relief out of the workhouse and in making the workhouse an abode in which none but the really destitute will continue." [3]

During the second quarter of the century the attention of public spirited citizens seems to have been given to moral questions. At least moral considerations received greater stress as causes of poverty than the economic and social causes later stressed. It was the heyday of Malthusianism. The teaching of moral restraint was in the air. While many private relief societies of various types con-

[1] Robert W. Bruere, "The Good Samaritan, Incorporated," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, Vol. CXX, p. 834 (1910).

[2] J. F. Richmond, "New York and Its Institutions," 1609-1873. Revised Edition, pp. 505-506 (1873).

[3] Nassau William Senior, "Provision for the Poor and the Condition of the Laboring Classes in a Considerable Portion of America and Europe." London (1835).

tinued to be founded,[1] "more attention was given to temperance agitation than to charitable reforms." [2] Of the relief societies organized many united moral objects with relief of physical want. This was the period of Tract Society and City Mission Society.[3] Robert W. Bruere points out in discussing the period under review that "The theory that people were poor because they were intemperate, thriftless, or lazy was not entirely the product of the aristocratic prejudices of the best citizens of the day." . . . "It was in great measure true that the destitute beggars, who congregated in our cities, suffered either through dense ignorance of their opportunities or through the lack of the moral and physical stamina that led so many of their sturdier fellows to avail themselves of the boundless natural resources that America offered gratuitously to any who were ready to take a hand in building the nation." [4] As we are now beginning to realize, many doubtless lacked mental stamina as well. Feeblemindedness probably played a large part in the problem of pauperism.

Even at this early date, it was charged that politics had entered in at least one place to complicate the situation. In 1826 in New York suffrage was extended to all male citizens, except negroes, without property qualifications. This occurred only a few years after "the energetic cunning and astuteness of Aaron Burr had definitely established Tammany Hall as the dominant political power in New York. The enfranchised beneficiaries of

[1] In this period, 1837, was incorporated the Philadelphia Union Benevolent Society, the first of the relief associations or societies for the improvement of the condition of the poor which was to constitute the first general movement in the United States for improving the material and social conditions of the poor in cities. See Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction (1899), p. 359.

[2] E. T. Devine, "The Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes." *The Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 121 (1900).

[3] New York City Tract Society was formed 1827. New York Protestant Episcopal City Mission Society (oldest City Mission in N. Y. C.) was incorporated in 1833.

[4] Robert W. Bruere, "The Good Samaritan, Incorporated," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, Vol. CXX, p. 834 (1910).

public poor relief thus acquired a new status as compliant troopers in political campaigns and offered a constant temptation to politicians to disburse city money with reference to elections rather than to the need or worth of the recipients."[1]

In 1837-38 there came a winter to New York with want so bitter that it set at naught all efforts at meeting it, including the poor house and stepping-mill. All sorts of hasty, ill-advised relief agencies were set on foot and they all together failed. By 1840 there were over thirty relief-giving societies in the city of New York, organized chiefly for particular phases of poverty, and conducted with little information and without concerted action. An informally constituted committee was organized in the winter of 1842-43 to provide facilities for meeting the unusual distress which followed the industrial depression and a severe winter. After making a careful examination of the situation, the committee condemned current schemes of charity on four counts: lack of discrimination in giving relief, lack of coöperation, failure to establish personal intercourse with the recipients of alms at their homes, and failure to relate their work to the existing public provision for the destitute.[2]

Out of such conditions an imperative demand arose for a comprehensive and well-considered attempt to grapple with poverty and to give charity a new and broader outlook. Thus was born the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor of New York City and through it the "A. I. C. P." Movement as it was popularly called, the predominant charitable development in America for the next thirty years. Among those who had taken an interest in the work of the committee just mentioned was Robert M. Hartley, who became the founder of the New York A. I. C. P., and the father of the movement

[1] Robert W. Bruere, "The Good Samaritan, Incorporated," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, Vol. CXX, p. 834 (1910).

[2] For a verbatim statement of the four conclusions of the committee, see E. T. Devine, "The Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes," *The Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 183 (1900).

launched thereby. As its corresponding secretary and general agent for many years, he became the guiding spirit of the organization. In founding the new association, Hartley builded slowly. He first visited Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore and other cities and corresponded with persons in this country and abroad that the new organization might avoid principles and methods not tested by experience. It appears that he considered these visits of little value, and that the system which he subsequently put into operation was elaborated out of his own mind.[1] There seems however to be evidence that he was unconsciously influenced by his study, especially by developments in Germany.

The name chosen for the new association gives its object. It was to be an organization interested primarily in improving the *condition* of the *poor*. Its energies were not to be dissipated on confirmed paupers. It was to stand "as a friendly and efficient barrier between the poverty-stricken sons and daughters of misfortune and the course of pauperism": [2] and by the kind attentions, counsel and aid it was able to bestow to save "multitudes from the lower, and almost hopeless depths of social degradation" [3] into which they otherwise would descend.

It was not the purpose of the new society to supersede any other, but simply to supply what in others was manifestly lacking. But so broad was its plan, that in a short time most of the others disbanded, leaving a far greater burden for it to carry than it had originally anticipated. The association divided the city into twenty-two districts, which were again subdivided into sections so small (278 for the city) that the visitor residing in each could call at the house of every applicant. Up to this time the customary practice of charitable organizations in America had been to limit their relief

[1] Memorial of Robert M. Hartley, p. 187 (1882).
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 376-377.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 376-377.

to special groups, such as certain nationalities, for special types of service or for special kinds of relief. The significant feature of the new association was its extension to cover the entire city. The visitor was a resident male volunteer, a member always of one of the wealthier families. He "pledged himself to withhold all relief from unknown persons, to visit in their homes those who appeared to require benevolent services, and, by discriminating and judicious relief combined with admonitions to prudence, thrift, diligence and temperance, to help them discover those hidden springs of virtue within themselves from which alone their prosperity might flow."[1] Hartley thus made a reality his dream of a large body of volunteers[2] who should devote themselves to improving the condition of the poor by personal service and knowledge of their needs. It is almost needless to add that remonstrance was often necessary to prevent these visitors from relaxing efforts at moral reform and calling in the discredited system of relying entirely upon almsgiving. The visitor is constantly enjoined that it is his duty to send all who bear "the mark of the corporation" (i.e., those cases considered as not improvable yet destitute) to the almshouse commissioner for relief, when the responsibility of the association towards such families ceases. To the "association" poor no supplies were given save through the visitor. The association gave no money and only such articles of food and clothing, in small quantities, as are least liable to abuse, "giving always coarser supplies than industry will procure." [3] In 1846 it organized a system for the gratuitous supply of medical aid to the indigent sick in portions of the city not reached by existing dispensaries. The association required every beneficiary to abstain from intoxicating drinks, to send

[1] Robert W. Bruere, "The Good Samaritan, Incorporated," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, Vol. CXX, p. 835 (1910).

[2] It was not until thirty-seven years later that this society employed its first paid visitor.

[3] J. F. Richmond, "New York and Its Institutions," 1609-1873, p. 506.

young children to school, and to apprentice children of suitable age.

Thus, the new organization began with "clear emphasis" upon the five following general principles for the administration of relief, which have survived with unimpaired validity to the present time. These are: "Relief out to be based upon an inquiry into the needs of the recipient. A district system equipped with local workers, including volunteers, offers the best method of relief distribution. Certain conditions, such as temperance, school attendance and vocational training, should be insisted upon. Beggars and the wilfully dependent should be deterred by making their lot less comfortable than that of able-bodied workers. Coöperation with other charities is essential."[1] But the association did not limit its activities to the personal needs of individuals; it early turned to the need of improving neighborhoods and social conditions generally. While refraining from undertaking certain reforms to which it would have been inclined, it was active in several fundamental reforms, of which probably the most important was the agitation for improved dwellings, the first fruit of which was the "report of the committee on the sanitary condition of the laboring classes of the city of New York with remedial suggestions," published in 1853. This report contained definite recommendations for legislative action, as well as an appeal to capitalists and owners of real estate to embrace the opportunity before them and to take advantage of "the singular privilege of becoming benefactors of the poor, with pecuniary advantage to themselves." "It appeared that most of the new tenement houses were on so contracted and penurious a scale that they were actually inferior to many of the old buildings whose places they supplied, that vice and pauperism were perpetuated by such causes, the almshouse and prisons supplied with

[1] Porter R. Lee, "Three Score Years and Ten," an editorial. *The Survey,* Vol. XXI, p. 225 (1913).

recruits and the city burdened with taxes for the support of dependents." [1] Besides, for many years the Association made inspections of tenements, reported as to sanitary condition and, if necessary, called upon the authorities to enforce laws.

Of hardly less importance the Association inaugurated a milk campaign of the most far-reaching character and was instrumental in securing a law to prevent the adulteration of milk. In addition, it waged unceasing war with the public nuisances of the city, its lotteries, Sabbath desecration, gambling dens and intemperance. In 1851 it projected the New York Juvenile Asylum. A public washing and bathing establishment was established in 1852, at an expense of $42,000, and the following year the Association procured an act to provide for the care and instruction of idle truant children.

In 1854 the Children's Aid Society of New York City was formed by the demands of "a public sentiment which the Association had largely created." [2] A Workmen's Home was erected in 1855, by the direction of the Association at an expense of $90,000. In 1863 it organized the Society for the Relief of the Ruptured and Crippled. One should not fail to mention among the enterprises of the earlier days, certain public lectures on personal and domestic hygiene for which the Association was responsible.

From what has preceded it is apparent that Hartley was not ignorant of the vast sea of pauperism about him. His Association, however, disclaimed all responsibility in regard to the existence of the evil, its increase or extermination, except it came within its prescribed bounds,[3] such as any effort that might educate the public to desist from indiscriminate alms-giving. In line with this Hartley wrote, among other things, a paper on "What Shall Be Done with Paupers and Criminals," in which he states

[1] E. T. Devine, "Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes," *The Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 187 (1900).
[2] J. F. Richmond, "New York and Its Institutions," p. 508 (1873).
[3] "Memorial of Robert M. Hartley," pp. 376-377 (1882).

that "it will not be doubted by those who have carefully explored the poorer quarters of the city, that there are at least 20,000 of the lower strata of the population who, though able to work, mostly subsist without labor. In their general habits they are charlatan impostors. Many of them make their rounds among the numerous private charitable organizations, which have no knowledge of each other's actions, nor yet of the applicants; artful beggars turn this ignorance to their own advantage, and are aided by many societies at the same time, without detection." [1] The first annual report of the new Association pointed out that "without coöperation too little will be gained in the contest with the forces of experienced and crafty pauperism; with it, the walls of Jericho will fall down." Unfortunately no practical steps were ever successfully taken to insure such coöperation between the charitable societies caring for the poor of the city, so that in spite of the enlarged public and private provisions for the relief of the destitute, "the streets were still filled with mendicants, the benevolent were harassed with applications, and importunate impostors were constantly obtaining the aid which was designed only for the needy and deserving."

"To remove the evil," writes Hartley, "we must remove the causes; and these being chiefly moral—whatever subsidiary appliances may be used—they admit only moral remedies." [2] Accordingly the publication of tracts and pamphlets became an important part of the work of the Association. Thus many copies of a twelve-page pamphlet entitled "The Economist" were circulated, and Poor Richard's famous brochure, "The Way to Wealth" was published as a tract by the Association with, however, several appended extracts from Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, calculated to supply what was regarded as a want of religious sentiment in the original. The language of the

[1] "Memorial of Robert M. Hartley," p. 375 (1882).
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 307 (1882).

tracts was outspoken. They contained no sentimentalizing. The appeal, couched in moral phrases, was always to self-help. The following sentences culled from one are illustrative:

"Every able-bodied man in this country may support himself and family comfortably; if you do not, it is probably owing to idleness, improvidence, or intemperance. . . . You will gossip and smoke, neglect your children and beg, live in filth and discomfort, drink and carouse, do almost anything rather than work, and expect, forsooth, to be supported by charity. . . . Some of you in all honesty ask not alms, but work; but how will you get what does not exist? There are so many more hands than work that by remaining here you are doomed to starve in idleness or subsist by charity. . . . To the sober and industrious we say, 'Stay not here in idleness and want, when the wide and fertile country offers you employment and all that is needful for comfort and elevation.' "

The example set in New York City by Hartley and his associates resulted in the launching of many similar associations in American and several in Europe. While the association in New York City supplied the model, these newer societies emanated in their respective places from the same common necessity and the same charitable impulse that led to the organization of the pioneer society.

Brooklyn, then a separate municipality, organized its Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor almost simultaneously with New York City (1843). Its "Visitors' Manual" was similar to that of New York, that the system might be uniform in both cities. In 1849 the Baltimore Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor was founded with objects similar to the New York and Brooklyn associations. Of the large cities, Boston was next to follow, establishing the Boston Provident Association in 1851. The Boston Association, like its predecessors, districted the city, each subdivision of

which had its volunteer visitor whose business it was to visit, to investigate, and if necessary to relieve all families known to be in distress, including those who were referred to them by subscribers through whose contributions the Association was supported.[1]

In Philadelphia in 1855 a committee appointed by a town meeting for the "Relief of the Suffering Poor" outlined a scheme of work including the districting of the city similar to the A. I. C. P. of other cities, except that the members of a committee were to be a body corporate under the name of "The Philadelphia Society for the Prevention of Pauperism and the Relief of the Deserving Poor," and were to be chosen from each ward of the city from persons fitted by experience and judgment for the position, first by a convention of Benevolent Societies then meeting, and thereafter by the Mayor, the Judges of the city or the City Councils. Little ever seems to have come of this elaborate plan. In 1859, because of the protest of the taxpayers that they were supporting at least 1,000 able-bodied men and women, the appropriation for outdoor relief was cut down. Conditions generally did not materially change until 1878, when a committee was formed to provide some means by which the charities of the city might be protected from the countless impositions practiced upon them, which resulted in the formation of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity, later described (see pp. 187-193).

In 1857, following the financial crisis of that year, the

[1] An illuminating picture of provisions in Boston for the poor who were at the same time incurable is found in the following passage. "For such there remained only the almshouse. Largely by the effort of Miss Harriet Ryan, the Channing Home for the treatment of incurable diseases came into existence in 1857. The number of patients at one time was limited to fifteen, since the care of that number was 'as much as one woman could do.' As Miss Ryan was devoting her mornings to her work as a hairdresser in order to earn money for the institution and in the late afternoon often went about with a basket to collect food for her patients this assumption was probably correct." William H. Mahoney, "Benevolent Hospitals in Metropolitan Boston," *Quarterly Publication of American Statistical Association*, Vol. XIII, p. 420 (1913).

"Chicago Relief and Aid Society" was organized. Although the society adopted a different name, it was undoubtedly indebted directly, or through the influence of other societies which had copied the plan, to the New York Association for many of its leading features. This is shown most clearly in the general rules of the society, which follow at most points the rules of the parent organization. As in New York, a division of the city into districts was instituted in Chicago. In 1871, when the great Chicago fire occurred, destroying $192,000,000 worth of property, taking approximately 300 lives and destroying about one-half of the homes of the city, leaving 98,500 persons homeless, the Relief and Aid Society, at the request of the Mayor and the Citizens' Committee within a few days took entire charge of all contributions for the needy. This was a task of such magnitude as had up to that time probably never fallen to the lot of any other charitable organization in Europe and America. It required the receiving and disbursing within a period of about six months of the sum of $5,000,000 for the relief of sufferers from the fire. In this work the society "gave a notable example of the efficiency, the true economy of organized over unorganized relief."[1] The subsequent history of the crystalization of this association, its antagonism to the changing standards of relief-giving looking to greater efficiency, affords but one of the many instances of philanthropic enterprises which have outgrown their usefulness.

In 1860 the St. Louis Provident Association, another society belonging to this pre-charity organization epoch, was founded because of the distress incident to the impending Civil War, a calamity doubly severe in a slave-holding city on the frontier, as St. Louis was then. Up to that time there had been no great call for charity in the city, which was a rapidly growing prosperous town

[1] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 14 (1903).

of 160,773 persons. During the war, the Association did yeoman service in meeting the immediate distress of the time.[1]

In 1876 the St. Paul Society for the Relief of the Poor was organized, following in the wake of the depression of '73. It was the last society to be organized as a part of the movement inaugurated by Robert Hartley forty years earlier. At the time of its organization, the founder of the New York association wrote "that applications for the publications of the association (The New York A. I. C. P.) had exceeded the supply, that at least twenty-nine organizations had been formed in the United States on its acknowledged plan.

It is surprising that a movement which began with so much promise should lose whatever grip it once had on the throat of bad conditions. Such, however, is the fact recorded by many in describing the conditions in the charitable world in the period just preceding the birth of the charity organization movement in 1877.[2] The function of dispensing material aid so submerged all others that the Associations for Improving the Conditions

[1] The St. Louis Association demonstrates the possibility of an old established institution learning to adjust to meet new conditions by employing modern methods. St. Louis has never had a C. O. S., due in part to the belief that it is best to combine the work of a relief society with that of a charity organization society. While for a number of years preceding 1890 the association hardly served as more than a society to provide "hand-outs" for those in distress, since then the association has modernized its methods of work so that to-day it has assumed the functions of a society for organizing charity. In Chicago and Baltimore the older relief societies have been merged with the respective charity organization society in each city. In Philadelphia and Boston there has been a continued co-existence of the two kinds of agencies; while in New York City both an A. I. C. P. and a C. O. S. exist, though the present similarity of some of the functions of the two agencies means a certain duplication of machinery in caring for the poor of the city.

[2] See S. H. Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," pp. 118, 119 (1882); Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 130 (also see page 14); E. T. Devine, "Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes," *The Charities Review,* Vol. X, p. 268 (1900); Chas. D. Kellogg, "Report of the Committee on History of Charity Organization,"

of the Poor generally had sunk into a sea of alms-giving. "The work of these associations," writes Warner, "was done more or less well; but there is a general agreement that twenty years after their organization, private alms-giving in American cities, for the most part through formal and even incorporated societies, was profuse and chaotic, while still not meeting the demands made upon it." [1]

Why, it is natural to ask, did this movement, beginning in the 40's with such bright prospects, fail to fulfill the expectations which it awoke?

One answer is that unfortunately the objects of these associations stated in the charters and articles of incorporation "were seldom kept as clearly in view as they were at the time when the first societies were founded. At the end of the 70's they had become for the most part simply relief societies, and often their administration of relief had fallen into routine methods and was far from contributing as much as it should to the elevation of the physical and moral condition of the indigent. . . . Little use was made of voluntary friendly visitors, and consequently organized relief, if it accomplished its purpose of aiding the destitute, did not educate the charitable public in intelligent and discriminating relief methods. Public outdoor relief was in many places lavish, and its administration careless, extravagant and in some instances, corrupt. There were no adequate safeguards against deception, no common registration of relief to prevent duplication, and private almsgiving, while it was profuse in meeting the obvious distress, was admittedly and wholly inadequate in meeting situations

in Proceedings, National Conference Charities and Correction, 20th session (1893); E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," p. 344 (1904); Rev. James M. Pullman, "The Development of Charity Organization," *Lend-a-Hand*, Vol. XI, p. 422 (1893).

[1] Amos G. Warner, "American Charities," Revised Edition, p. 442 (1908).

which require generous financial contributions, and long continued and persistent personal attention."[1]

A fundamental defect in Hartley's original plan seems to have lain in the division of work given to the volunteers. The visitors themselves were responsible for the decision as to giving relief and gave it themselves. They had to account for it and that kept their minds on relief.

The fact that not until thirty-seven years after its organization was the first paid visitor employed, deprived these volunteer visitors of a conception of a progressive knowledge of individual treatment resulting from a force of workers trained for service.

Some of the largest associations in the movement ultimately discontinued all volunteer service in order to promote "efficiency in the disbursement of relief."[2] This swing from an all-volunteer service to a non-volunteer service was fraught with equally serious consequences.[3] The reason for allowing volunteers to drop out of the service of these associations would seem to indicate that some of the responsible leaders in the movement stood little chance of organizing the charitable spirit of their respective communities.[4]

The situation was made more difficult by the fact that although Hartley stressed the value of coöperation, no practical steps, as has been pointed out, were ever suc-

[1] E. T. Devine, "Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes," *The Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 268 (1900). I am indebted to Mr. Sherman C. Kingsley for the statement that the emphasis was on momentary treatment, some investigators priding themselves on treating cases but once.

[2] E. T. Devine, "The Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes," *Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 308.

[3] See Section on rôle of the volunteer, pp. 145-156.

[4] The case of the Provident Association of Boston is illustrative. "The volunteer visitors were found difficult to control; many lacked judgment; most of them were extravagant and often neglected to forward their monthly reports. Capt. A. G. Goodwin, who was for 20 years the general agent, used to say that the visitors often gave him more trouble than the applicants. So the volunteers were gradually allowed to drop off, their places being filled by paid visitors." E. T. Devine, "The Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes," *Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 180 (1900).

cessfully taken to insure such coöperation between the charitable societies caring for the poor of the city. The A. I. C. P. movement failed in part at least through lack of preparation to carry through its ambitious program. Of the other factors contributing to this failure, not the least important was the fact that conditions which the earlier A. I. C. P.'s had been called upon to face had changed, but the A. I. C. P.'s did not change with them, but often sank deep in ruts of administering relief by "rule of thumb." In the 40's applicants for relief were not so absolutely foreign to the persons and societies to which they applied for relief as they had become in the 70's. While complete investigation in the 40's might have always proved beneficial, its neglect in the 70's was spelling only disaster and chaos. Conditions had changed in another respect. The A. I. C. P. movement was inaugurated by Protestants, controlled by Protestants and supported by Protestant money. Although they aided other than Protestants, "no emphasis was laid on their not being sectarian. Their influence and their effort on public opinion was largely confined to Protestant circles. This was not strange at a time when the intelligence and wealth of most of our American cities was so exclusively Protestant."[1] As the need for increasing coöperation was made necessary by the increasing chaos in charity, emphasis on non-sectarianism became imperative.

Besides being handicapped by its sectarianism, the movement doubtless suffered in not having a democratic basis. As has been pointed out, the volunteer visitors were chosen from among the wealthy families.

An important part of the answer to our question lies in the fact that the various associations had undergone a process of crystallization. They ceased being flexible, progressive. This was doubtless in part due to the personnel of those in control in the 70's. "The officials

[1] Robert W. de Forest, "The Federation of Organized Charities," *Charities*, Vol. XII, p. 20 (1904).

employed were very often persons whose chief qualifications appear to have been their own need of employment, and to those officials, too often, was left by bodies of managers the actual management." [1]

All social institutions are prone to crystallization. That some attain great age is almost *prima facie* evidence that the process of crystallization has never proceeded so far at any one time but that it was possible (changing the figure) to pour new wine into old bottles. Occasionally in the history of social institutions new bottles become necessary because crystallization had proceeded too far. Such seems to have been the reason for the independent and almost spontaneous birth in the 70's and early 80's of a number of new societies whose special concern was to be the *organization* of charitable effort that greater efficiency might result.

In any such comparison it should always be remembered that those working in the earlier days had less experience behind them on which to base their conclusions and guide their efforts. Moreover, the time and attention of the public spirited and humanitarian of the nation had been turned to the all-absorbing national questions which for more than a century had involved the permanency of the republic. At such times it was easy, at least for the average man, to forget that the poor existed, or that they needed other attention than the doles which the relief societies had become accustomed to give. Yet Tuckerman's faith that actually visiting the poor will help to find the way out is shown by the fact that Miss Morse, the founder of the Confidential Exchange in

[1] Jeffrey K. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 14 (1903).

"At the time when the New York Charity Organization Society was organized in 1882, the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor which started out with its large corps of district visitors, and which in the fifties and sixties had been the champion of tenement house reform, had reduced its functions largely to the giving of mere material relief at the hands of a paid agent and his paid assistants." Robert W. de Forest, "The Federation of Organized Charities," *Charities*, Vol. XII, p. 20 (1904).

Boston, the first in the country,[1] conceived that idea while she was a visitor of the Boston Provident Association, and by the fact that it was Dr. Vogel, another overworked volunteer visitor of the same association who encouraged Mrs. Fields and Mrs. Lodge to establish the Coöperative Society of Volunteer Visitors of Boston.[2] It would be interesting to trace the development of various societies existing to-day which have survived from the movement just reviewed, but such would carry us too far afield. Suffice it to say that few if any of the criticisms justly made during the 70's and early 80's, longer obtain.

[1] See pp. 199, 200.
[2] See p. 178.

CHAPTER IV

THE FUNCTIONS OF A CHARITY ORGANIZATION SOCIETY

THE student of society rightly asks what is the peculiar function of every social institution, what services does it render of which society would be deprived if it did not exist? While there have been differences of opinion in many communities upon important questions of policy, fortunately there is no appreciable doubt or confusion as to the functions of the charity organization society. They are threefold: first and basic, the rehabilitation of families which for any reason fail to be self-sufficient; second, the education of the community in correct principles of relief; and third, aid in the elimination of the causes of poverty.

From the Program of the Thirty-first Annual Meeting of The Charity Organization Society of the City of New York.

I. FAMILY REHABILITATION

Believing that the family is a sound institution of great value and that its relationships when normal may prove "the means of restored independence and prosperity,"[1] the first function of charity organization workers

[1] Helen Bosanquet, "The Family," p. 342 (1906).

is the restoration of normal family life as far as that may be possible [1] in all families coming under their care.

"What charity organization stands for specifically is intensive, discriminating, thorough, and sympathetic consideration of the individual man, woman, or child, of the particular family which for any reason fails to be self-supporting and self-sufficient." [2] It is its especial concern to "make a careful study of each family that becomes dependent, devising on the basis of this knowledge a plan for its rehabilitation." [3]

Previous to the advent of the charity organization society there were agencies that gave the poor fuel, and agencies that gave them clothing, and agencies even that gave them soup. There were few or no agencies that possessed that particular kind of persevering industry which makes it a specialty "to take trouble to find out what to do, and then get it done; that will ask every question, think out every detail, write every letter, pay every visit that can possibly make the poor better off." [4] Since the days of the earlier charity organization societies specialization in social work has been carried so far as to make this type of service even still more necessary. To-day as never before is there need of an agency like a charity organization society which knows how to use specialists and how to coördinate the many kinds of specialized social work that are coming into existence.

The multiplicity of social agencies which to-day touch the family at various angles, such as children's agencies, hospital social service departments, and visiting nurse associations, naturally raises the question as to what should

[1] For a definition of "normal," see Margaret F. Byington, "The Normal Family," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. LXXVII, pp. 26-27 (1918).

[2] Edward T. Devine, "Social Ideals Implied in Present American Programs of Voluntary Philanthropy," *Publications of the American Sociological Society*, Vol. VII, p. 186 (1912).

[3] Margaret Byington, "What Social Workers Should Know About Their Own Communities," p. 27 (1911 edition).

[4] Mary E. Richmond, "How a Web of Organized Charity Is Spun," *Charities*, Vol. X, p. 126 (1903).

be a proper division of the field of family rehabilitation among them, especially in view of the probable need for limiting intake to improve standards of work. The problem is still to be worked out. It seems reasonable, however, to say that the agency which is logically in the best position to make such a division is the local charity organization society because it stands, or should, at the centre of the family welfare work of the community.

In the discharge of its first function then, a charity organization society is to those who are economically and socially ill, what a physician is to the individual physically sick. The relation in both cases is, in some aspects at least, that of expert and patient.[1]

II. Education of the Community in Correct Principles of Relief

"The charity organization society undertakes a more difficult task than the direct relief of distress. This is to insure that the limited amount of charitable work which any one society may perform shall be done in such a way as to train the volunteer who coöperates in doing it." [2] A charity organization society seeks constantly to interest volunteers in its work because it views as not least among its functions "the education and training of the charitably disposed individual, the men and women who are willing to give either time or money, or both, for the relief of distress." [3] The really fundamental and peculiar principle of a charity organization society is to help the poor by the education of the public in wise and adequate charitable methods. "It is not too much to say that the chief aim of the charity organization society is

[1] No adequate term has yet been coined to describe the relationship of persons under the care of a charity organization society to the society. The terms "client," "patient" and "ward," though each has its merits, are hardly adequate. The term client however is being used increasingly.

[2] E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," p. 354 (1904).

[3] *Ibid.*

to improve the charitable methods of the general public."[1] The quality of the benevolence of a community is the direct test of the efficiency of a charity organization society. Other tests while valuable are none the less indirect. A charity organization society should develop standards of family work for the while community, even though it ultimately loses its own life thereby. "After all allowances are duly made," writes Jeffrey R. Brackett, "while many of the societies for organizing charity cannot be counted really as educational forces, the fact remains that the leading societies are distinctly educational and represent a remarkable movement for progress. They stand for study of causes of need, for the diffusion of knowledge on all matters of charity administration and relief."[2]

A Charity Organization Society Claims No Monopoly of Charity

The first work therefore of a charity organization society is to help people make their own individual charity more effective, not to do the work of people for them. A charity organization society stands for the "democratizing of social welfare efforts."[3] It does not claim or want a monopoly of all the charity of a community.[4] Charitable relief is supposed to be very well organized when it is honestly administered, avoids duplicating the work of other relief agencies and is not wasted on arrant imposters. "But," adds Miss Richmond, "relief is not organized in the charity organization sense of the word if it is permitted to check the development of the charitable spirit among the poor or among the charitable them-

[1] E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," p. 354 (1904).

[2] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 133 (1903).

[3] See interesting article with this title by John Melpolder, *The Survey*, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 303-304 (1916).

[4] It is of interest to note that this position was taken by the London Mendicancy Society in 1805. See p. 51.

selves. It checks charity if it is separated from personal relations with the poor, or is used as a substitute for such relations. If it relieves people of any share of just responsibility toward relatives, friends, fellow church members, employees, or less favored acquaintances, it checks charity. Any form of organized relief that ignores these dangers or does not strive earnestly to minimize them, is itself more dangerous than disorganized relief possibly can be."[1] A charity organization society should never say, "Subscribe to us, and we'll protect you from the poor; we'll do the rest." It should rather serve as a channel "through which the charity of a community may flow from its people to its poverty, with least waste and with greatest efficiency."[2]

What has been said of the possibility of lessening the charitable spirit of any community applies with equal force to the possibility of pauperizing other social agencies, especially in the matter of investigation. Should a C. O. S. investigate for other local agencies, for the department of Public Health, for State institutions? Aside from the fact that investigation (diagnosis) is an inseparable part of treatment, experience seems to answer this question negatively, or at least that the service should never be continued longer than is necessary to show the agency or institution in question how it should be done. Time and energy had better be spent in bringing pressure on public officials and others to improve their own work than to do it for them. However, as a matter of practical expediency, the charity organization society may, as in more than one community, investigate for the Poor Law officials or actually handle the entire public outdoor relief work of the community; relief being granted by the public officials only on the requisition of the local charity organization society. A description of such an arrangement

[1] M. E. Richmond, "What is Charity Organization?" *Charities Review*, Vol. IX, p. 492 (1900).

[2] Porter R. Lee, "Treatment," p. 11, pamphlet published by the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation (1910).

recently inaugurated closes with the following significant words, "While the ideal plan for the future is for the public department to engage a trained staff adequate to give constructive treatment to all cases, the present plan is believed to have its advantages. It is gaining public support for modern methods of relief to such an extent that when the public is called upon to pay the salaries of a large trained staff, it will be more willing to do so."[1]

Although a charity organization society would feel that it was defeating one of its chief objects,[2] namely, the education of the community in correct principles of relief, if it gained a monopoly of all charitable activity and so deprived people of the education which alone can come from a first-hand contact with the poor, there is an equally vital reason for not seeking such a monopoly, namely, the pressure of work which it would cause. The progress of knowledge in medicine, sanitation, biology has brought an increasing number of family problems to charity organization societies and has meant a more extended treatment for many as well. This increasing burden which the new knowledge has temporarily at least brought with it would swamp any society which attempted to carry it all, and equally serious, it would mean before the final collapse, such a lowering of standards of work as to cause almost irreparable harm. The question of how far to limit intake to improve the quality of output is a most difficult one to answer, especially when one is confronted with the concrete situation. Certainly it is easy to understand why a society is tempted to take up all the work that comes to it. Without attempting to lay down a hard and fast rule on the burning issue of "controlling intake," one may well raise the question as to whether a society which does insist on maintaining high standards,

[1] "Public Relief by a Private Agency," *The Survey*, p. 228 (1918).

[2] "The really fundamental and peculiar principle of the charity organization society is to help the poor by the education of the public in wise and adequate charitable methods." Samuel H. Bishop, "A New Movement in Charities," *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 447 (1901).

no matter whatever else is involved, is not in the long run rendering the greatest social service to the community. Certainly the aim of a charity organization society is as much to establish standards of technique in relieving distress as to relieve the distress itself.

A related question of importance is whether it is the function of a charity organization society to supply relief for cases under the care of specialized social agencies such as medical and children's agencies. It is in harmony with the position already held as to the educational function of a charity organization society to hold that such is not its function, except in so far as these are definitely "C. O. S." problems for other reasons. It is the belief of at least one expert that the only ways out of the difficulty involved are for all specialized case workers to raise their own relief funds, or for charity organization workers along with others to work for the "extension and reorganization of public outdoor relief as a fund to be drawn upon by qualified agencies in connection with their treatment of their own clients."[1]

III. To Aid in Eliminating the Causes of Poverty

In social work with families the readjustments necessary are not all on the side of the individual out of adjustment. No amount of individual cleanliness can make a dark interior tenement a healthy abode. In other words, the individual frequently can not be adjusted to society unless social conditions are improved, made more just and humane. The individual's lack of adjustment is in such cases not a consequence of personal weakness. Moreover, since in bad social conditions are to be found many of the ultimate causes of poverty, it follows that in its work of rehabilitation, charity must concern itself

[1] Porter R. Lee, "Some Necessary Readjustments in C. O. S. Case Work," an address delivered at a meeting of the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity (May 12, 1915).

with social conditions as well. Therefore, in addition to the functions just described of relieving individual distress and of educating the community in better methods of charity, a charity organization society has a still further obligation laid upon it, namely, to aid in the elimination of the causes of poverty.[1] While not claiming a monopoly in this field, it must be apparent to every student of the history of the charity organization movement in this country that increasing emphasis has been placed by leaders in its ranks on removing the social causes of poverty at the same time that it has cared for the individual, not always, but often, the victim of those causes. In this sense it is the purpose of every charity organization society to work for its own extinction, or at least to work for the lessening of its work to that point where none who receive its aid could have avoided their present condition of need if both the individual and society had done all in his or its power respectively to make impossible the phenomenon of a human being unable to provide for his own support.

"When in its work for individual families a charity organization society becomes aware of certain causes of poverty, it attempts either through special committees of

[1] The work of any organization dealing with dependent families, says Mr. Frank Tucker, formerly General Agent of the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, ought to have two purposes: First, the elimination of causes of dependence by creating public sentiment, by opposing bad legislation and urging good, by special investigations intended to show up particular evils, by agitating for proper housing, health supervision, pure food, by developing municipal activities such as public baths, playgrounds, parks, etc.; second, the actual care and treatment of dependent families with a view to re-establishing their self-dependence or providing adequate relief to supplement their subnormal earning capacity when their condition should be made as nearly normal as possible in their own homes.

This first phase should be kept constantly in mind by the charity worker, for when public or private meetings are held to discuss any one of these questions she should be ready to contribute from her knowledge of specific conditions and needs.

Frank Tucker, "What a Charity Worker is Expected to Do," *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 30 (1901).

its own or by stimulating the formation of new agencies, to remove these causes."[1] It should be noted that this also is *organizing charity*, but about a community need as distinguished from that of a single family. A charity organization society may thus touch practically all the social problems of a modern community.

Consideration of Methods of Aiding in the Elimination of the Causes of Poverty

There is no room for dogmatism as to whether a charity organization society should itself ever undertake to attack the causes of poverty. Under certain circumstances the society may well decide to create special committees of its own[2] for this purpose, believing that "everything is germane to a charity organization society which is needed in the community and is not already well done,"[3] and that it is immaterial who undertakes the job so long as as the work gets done. Under other circumstances the stimulation of the formation of new agencies to attack the causes of poverty may be the part of wisdom, "to act as midwife, so to speak, for new social organisms."[4] Though a final answer as to which is the better method is not possible, a consideration of certain factors which

[1] Margaret G. Byington, "What Social Workers Should Know about their Own Communities," p. 28 (1911 edition).

[2] Among the societies of the large cities, that of New York City is the great exception in the line of doing community work as an integral part of its work. Even so the Department for the Improvement of Social Conditions of this society "has nothing to do with the care and treatment of families"—See *The Survey*, Feb. 4, 1911, p. 1406. The tendency in the New York Society has been to centralize for efficiency and to give concrete evidence of work done. The other large cities have followed in the main the Boston ideal of stimulating the formation of new agencies separate from the start, though including among their directors some of the same people as were in the Associated Charities. There are, nevertheless, remains all over the country of societies that have copied the structure of the New York C. O. S., even to the names and number of committees. Frequently but few of these committees are active.

[3] Robert W. de Forest quoted by Alice L. Higgins. "The Summer School of Philanthropy," *Charities*, Vol. IX, p. 47 (1902).

[4] "Thirty-second Annual Report," Buffalo C. O. S., p. 56 (1909).

should weigh heavily in deciding the question in individual instances is of value.

There is in the first place the question of thoroughness. Few will gainsay the contention that a charity organization society should delimit its field until it is attempting to do no more work than it can do well. The efficiency of a C. O. S. rests on the quality of its social case work. Such work "calls for hard and persistent effort in lines that are easily slighted, and a society's lapse from the standard is not vindicated by its assumption of other functions."[1]

There is in the next place the question of expediency. Often the society in its private councils may suggest this or that agitation by an individual member as being at that time and place more immediately practicable than action by the society. It may thus save the delay of waiting for such a vote, or it may seem more likely to bring results than a vote. Expediency alone is never a safe guide. A society may easily be tempted to undertake activities outside of its family work for financial or even publicity reasons. Children's work, fresh air work has advertising value in that it can be understood by all. If, however, these activities are carried on at the expense of sound case work with the families under its care, the price paid is too large. This does not mean that charity organization workers should lose sight of the fact that benevolent individuals have widened their interests since the beginning of the movement until they include problems of health, industry, recreation and education. This shift of interest rather makes it all the more imperative that the charity organizationist make clear the vital relationship between social case work and movements for improving social conditions. There is furthermore the question of the possibility of pauperizing the philanthropic spirit of a community. It is one thing for an organization itself to carry the charitable burden of a

[1] *Charities*, Vol. IX, p. 19 (1902).

community; it is another and far more desirable achievement to educate the community up to carrying its own burdens.

The Charity Organization Society in Smaller Communities

The "cost of leadership" is a vital question in all small communities and makes impossible the minute subdivision of labor and specialization often found in communities of over 100,000. Because of the limitations upon possible funds for social purposes and because of the need of obtaining the best possible grade of trained leadership, it is generally necessary for the charity organization society in a small community to work on the committee plan, thus undertaking several forms of service. Obviously there will be differences in the programs of societies in places of from ten to twenty thousand inhabitants, where often the secretary has to provide the only trained social leadership, and in cities of over one hundred thousand, where the charity organization society is only one of a group of strongly developed agencies working together possibly in a central council of social agencies.[1]

Whenever opportunity comes to a charity organization society in a community of less than one hundred thousand population to bring about separate organizations, advantage of it should be taken. But the responsibility of the society for seeing that the necessary community program is carried out cannot be sidestepped, provided only and in all cases that at the bottom of the program is intensive family work.[2] In short, whatever activities are undertaken should be limited to the revelations of the day-to-day case work. In one smaller, com-

[1] From address by Francis H. McLean, delivered at the sixth annual meeting of the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity, June 6, 1917, at Pittsburgh.

[2] Francis H. McLean, "Societies for Organizing Charity," *The Survey*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 537 (1912).

munity concentration has been carried so far because of the "cost of leadership" that no less than twenty-seven activities are being conducted by seven small societies. There is, however, in such cases a line beyond which concentration is accompanied by unusual dangers. When a combination of activities means that a family welfare agency must become engrossed in such administrative details as buying food, coal, etc.; in short, in "running a plant," as in the case of a day nursery, it is more than likely that the families under its care will suffer, and that the quality of its case work will deteriorate.

A Charity Organization Society Defined

We are now in a position to give a more adequate and comprehensive definition of a charity organization society than has hitherto been possible. Because the functions of such a society are, as has been pointed out, several, and each complex, this is no easy task. To organize means, to use dictionary definitions, to bring together the interdependent parts into a living whole, to arrange the several parts for action or work. Organization as used therefore in connection with charity means bringing together into a living whole the social forces of a community, personal or institutional, to the end of accomplishing a given task by united effort. An individual can organize charity. When the needs of any considerable number of people come to notice constantly, then a larger unit—a society for organizing charity—is needed. Such societies are however "only devices which men have created in order to help them to be charitable more effectively." [1] It should therefore never be overlooked that charity organization is a larger conception than merely a new type of social agency,—it is a new method of using the existing charitable forces and resources of a community and may be

[1] Porter R. Lee, "Treatment," p. 11, pamphlet published by the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation (1910).

used by an individual as well as by a social agency, and is used by many of the latter, who do not include charity organization in their titles.[1]

Therefore, perhaps as good a definition of a charity organization society as can be given is: *A device to aid all who will work together to find out, need by need, what is the best way out of a given difficulty, best for those on whom the need presses most heavily and best for the community at large; and to aid in seeing each problem through to a final solution, including the removal of all preventable causes of poverty, either by measures the society launches itself or by measures it stimulates others to launch.*[2]

It cannot be reiterated too often that it is impossible to copyright the name charity organization society, with the result that some societies which bear the title are such in name only. Charity organization as a principle is not automatic, and the title may cover a multitude of unrelated things.

Central Councils and Charity Organization Societies

To thoughtful students of social problems it has become increasingly clear that every community presents a series of problems calling for solution. Logic demands first a survey or diagnosis of the field and then a plan of action, in which the next thing that is most needed to be done in that particular place is indicated. "Not only is there a logical order of social development," writes Miss

[1] Children's Aid Societies are increasingly practicing and preaching the methods of charity organization. See Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 33rd session, pp. 95-106 (1906).

[2] In this definition and the description which has preceded, the author has laid himself open to the charge of dogmatism. It has been his purpose in this section to picture those common features of various societies which distinguish them from any type of charitable agency precedent to the charity organization movement. While neither a "typical" nor ideal charity organization society may exist, for purpose of instruction and study, both concepts have value.

Richmond, "but many organizations die because they are born out of due season. Overstimulation of any particular social activity by a campaign of publicity which is not carefully followed by personal field work and by a series of delicate adjustments to local needs, increases this death rate. These separate social movements should, as time goes on, and our social work becomes even more highly specialized than it is now, build up a social synthesis, a technique of inter-relations, involving much more careful preparation of the ground for both our legislative and our field operations, and then a generous making way for one another, a hearty lending a hand to one another for the sake of the harvest." [1]

Realization of the fact that without a "city plan" for philanthropic activities, essential unity of purpose and community planning can never be achieved, has led to the adoption in a number of cities of the plan of a "Central Council of Social Agencies." Central councils are "delegate bodies representing the social agencies of the city, these agencies still maintaining independence of action in all fields and being bound together by coöperative rather than contractual relationship." [2] It is thus a "body composed of officials, delegates from all the social agencies of a city, armed with advisory and influencing powers only, and with no direct administrative sphere excepting as concerns its own internal affairs." [3] Such a council meets at regular intervals, reviews the general situation in the field of social work, its delegates plan together for improvements and more effective coöperation, and when new lines of work are proposed decide among themselves in an amicable way

[1] Mary E. Richmond, "The Inter-Relation of Social Movements," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 37th session, p. 218 (1910).

[2] Francis H. McLean, "Central Councils and Community Planning," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 216 (1917).

[3] Francis H. McLean, "Charity Organization Field Work," pp. 25, 26, pamphlet published by the Russell Sage Foundation (1910).

which agency would be best fitted to undertake them.

Mr. Francis H. McLean has well pointed out that charity organization societies cannot discharge their responsibility for community planning "short of directly forwarding and furthering the community coöperation which shall see its best fruition in consistent social charting and programming." [1] In short, the charity organization movement must include the coördination of all efforts for improving social conditions. "Until better ways are shown," adds Mr. McLean, "the Central Council idea will be used largely though not exclusively. There are alternatives which may be adopted; [2] but we believe that the vision of the societies must not only mean the furtherance of good work, but the orderly, consistent furtherance of an adequate logical, social, movement, based upon facts, not fiction; in other words, backed by steady-going case work."

While the Central Council may largely be the result of efforts of the local charity organization society, the C. O. S. should neither "run" nor be "run by" the Central Council. Each of these conditions is fatal to the very objects for which the Council stands. The local society should have the same relationship to the Council that a chairman has to a case conference, in that it should stand ever ready with suggestions and be ready to initiate action when all others fail. Only thus can there be the development of community responsibility and true community planning. Since a charity organization society is a social agency like any other, such a policy will result in the minimum of friction and jealousy. It is just as important that the Central Council be absolutely divorced from any control of the internal affairs of the C. O. S. The work of a charity organization society demands the un-

[1] Francis H. McLean, "Charity Organization Field Work," pp. 25-26, pamphlet published by the Russell Sage Foundation (1910).

[2] For example, "Financial Federations," see pp. 170-171 of present volume.

divided thought and attention of those responsible for its policies and work. A body of delegates, each primarily interested in the agency he represents, always makes a poor body for administrative purposes.

There remain to be discussed several special services related to family social work, which are sometimes rendered by charity organization societies, but about which there is a question as to whether they are functions of such societies. These are the maintenance of an employment bureau, the work of charities endorsement, and the operation of a social service exchange.

Is the Maintenance of a Free Employment Bureau a Function of a C. O. S.?

Charity organization societies sometimes maintain employment departments, although the view generally held is that charity should never deal with the able-bodied unemployed.[1] Unemployment is a problem that is in the main industrial. Responsibility for the provision of free employment exchanges is one increasingly recognized by state and federal governments. Accordingly there is a growing uniformity of belief that a charity organization society should do everything possible to secure relief by work, for families who apply to it in the ordinary way and are known to be in need of treatment, but should never go beyond this. Sometimes societies establish bureaus of employment for the handicapped, but even here the service is limited to their own families. As in any "pre-collected" employment, there is danger of trying to fit the man to the job rather than the reverse, in which event the bureau becomes an accommodation to the public often for "cheap labor" rather than a means to individual or family rehabilitation.

[1] Amos G. Warner, "American Charities," revised edition, p. 262 (1908).

Charities Endorsement

In all cities there are organizations which have outlived their usefulness, are duplicating the work of others, or are poorly managed.[1] The importance, therefore, of the function of charities endorsement is obvious. The significance of having this service efficiently rendered is apparent when the vast sums of money and the amount of energy expended by a community's social agencies are considered, not to mention the serious injury to the poor and unfortunate that a carelessly managed social agency may cause.

The task of supervising a city's charities is no small one. This fact, coupled with its importance, raises the question as to the machinery to be used to secure the best results. The methods now used in various places include endorsement by the local charity organization society, the local Chamber of Commerce or Board of Trade, a municipal charities commission, a Central Council of Social Agencies and a joint committee representing the local commercial bodies and the social agencies. Machinery that may work successfully in one place may not in another. Much depends on the personnel and standing in the community of the organization to which the work is entrusted. Much also depends on one's conception of the purpose of charities endorsement. To some it may mean merely an exposure of "unworthy charities," meaning thereby those either actually fraudulent or run on financially unsound though well intentioned lines. To others it means not merely a prevention of a duplication of work but also an attempt to solve the problem of the relationship between the programs of different social agencies and

[1] The Inquiry Department of the United Charities of Chicago had on file in 1910 records concerning 1,414 institutions, agencies, schemes and individual solicitors that had operated in Chicago during the preceding nine years; 14.5 per cent of these were rated "very good"; 22.9 per cent "good"; 14.2 per cent "doubtful"; 25.6 per cent "bad"; 22.4 per cent not rated because of incomplete information.

he maintenance of standards of efficiency. It thus in-olves constructive social planning as well as protection of he benevolently inclined.

The author does not wish to dogmatize in answer to his question, since the data on which to pass judgment ire so meagre. He must content himself by presenting he rival claims made respectively on behalf of having charitable and non-charitable organizations render the ervice.

Considering the latter first, it is urged that it is inex-edient for a society seeking to increase coöperation in community to assume the rôle of a self-appointed udge.[1] A local chamber of commerce or board of trade s a neutral body and is not a judge in its own behalf. Moreover, it is urged that it represents the money-giving ublic, and so has a legitimate interest if not duty to keep nformed of the management of the city's philanthropies. Finally it is maintained that the endorsement of private harities by commercial bodies will increase the interest f business men generally in the social agencies of their ommunity.

On the other hand, the question has been raised by hose opposed to turning the function of charities en-lorsement over to commercial organizations, as to the ffect upon the spirit and content of social work of "the usiness man in charity." What, they ask, will be the onsequences in the course of a decade of the domination f the social agencies of a city by a local body of mer-hants and manufacturers, for the function of charities en-orsement carries with it the power to force on social gencies standards of operation and administration. It s pointed out that systems of audits and accounts appro-riate for ascertaining the administrative efficiency of hilanthropic agencies differ quite strikingly from the nancial accounts and audit found in business concerns

[1] In at least one large city this was the reason which led to a transfer f the work from the leading charitable society to the leading com-ercial organization.

operated for profit. It should not be overlooked, they urge, that a group of men whose training has been in business may secure an immediately economical administration rather than an efficient administration of the kind that spells economy in the long run. "The tests that" commercial agencies "are intelligent enough to apply," it is further pointed out, "are elementary; a charity might meet them all and still be doing a great harm to the poor. It would seem best, therefore, to confine their work to its legitimate field of reporting upon business enterprises, and to seek advice about charitable undertakings from charitable experts who are known to be both courageous and fair-minded." [1] The wisdom of centralization of power in social work raises many serious questions. Finally it is maintained that there is no more reason for the contributors to a city's charities being classified on the basis of membership in a certain commercial body than there is in their being classified as members of one denomination or another, or of one political party or another and on that classification being determiners of the standards of the social work of the community.

To meet the objections of having the work of charities endorsement in the hands of either a business organization or of one of the social agencies of the city, certain cities, as in Chicago, have turned to a non-charitable organization, which, however, is not strictly commercial the Chicago Association of Commerce, "including not only business men but the leading lawyers, ministers and physicians" of the city. Moreover, it is urged that where the charities endorsement work of a community is rendered by non-charitable organizations, there is nothing to prevent the creation of an advisory council composed of persons having an intimate knowledge of social work to assist such a body.

[1] M. E. Richmond, "The Good Neighbor," pp. 134-135 (1908).

Should the C. O. S. Manage the Social Service Exchange?

A social service exchange is a clearing house for "identifying information only" concerning all persons aided by those social agencies of a community who register in it. Ideally every agency dealing with family problems should consider its use an integral part of its work. In such a case the value of the exchange to all using it is greatly increased, and it becomes in truth a community activity. A social service exchange cannot increase its use by the social agencies of a community nor perform its maximum service in improving the quality of the case work of the agencies already using it, "unless the person who is in charge knows what good case work is, and believes that the Exchange can be so conducted as to improve it." [1]

Who then should manage the Exchange—the charity organization society, some other agency, or the societies jointly? There is good authority for saying that the Confidential Exchange is more likely to succeed if directly controlled by one agency, and that the one having the deepest enthusiasm for intensive work with families." [2] Since in most communities," writes Miss Byington, "this is or should be the charity organization society, it is, as a rule, the one that should conduct the Exchange." [3] Experience, however, is accumulating that may favor the ultimate independence of the social service exchange as a social agency or at least its joint control by several agencies.

[1] Margaret F. Byington, "The Confidential Exchange," Publication No. 28, Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, p. 9 (1912).

To-day the term "Social Service Exchange" is used to encourage its use by agencies whose activities are often regarded public services or at least semi-philanthropic to which the traditional odium of relief does not attach. It is felt the term confidential smacks of confirmed dependence. It is held wise, whatever the name of the exchange, to limit it to confidential information only because of the erroneous common feeling that relief involves a kind of personal degradation.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*

CHAPTER V

THE PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF CHARITY ORGANIZATION

CHARITY organization societies use the "case method" of work. Social case work is the art of doing different things for different individuals in such a way that the welfare of the individual and of society are harmonized as nearly as is humanly possible. In short, the case work method is the personality-by-personality method. To classify human beings is foreign to its spirit. Its corrollary, individualization of treatment, means the working out of a "definite plan for meeting the precise difficulties to be overcome" followed by the "long continued personal oversight which such a plan involves." [1] The plan may require the giving of material relief but it may as often be the securing of right medical attention, the encouragement of friendship, assistance by industrial training or instruction in how to use the machinery of our social life which previously had contributed little of value to the individual because of some lack of adjustment. It is essential above all that there be a far-sighted plan adjusted in all details to the needs of the case. The contrast between planned and planless charity is the real contrast between good and bad charity. For, as has well been pointed out, "to put one family beyond the need of charity is more useful than to tide twenty over into next week's misery."

Few if any individuals are entirely without family ties of one kind or another. Because of the social gain of

[1] E. T. Devine, "Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes," *Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 270 (1900).

keeping such ties intact, and where necessary, of strengthening them if possible, all planning in social case work is in last analysis family planning. "It is," writes Dr. Devine, "a deceptive philosophy that turns the back upon parents as hopeless and proposes to save the children. We cannot save children separately. We must reach and save the family as a whole, and we must do what we do in undisguised and unaffected friendship for the family as a whole." [1]

The social case worker, like the physician, never passes moral judgment on a patient. Once in a while one still hears the phrase "the worthy poor," or "the unworthy poor," but where found it marks the user as one unacquainted with the spirit of modern social work, which has long since outgrown it. Unlike the specialist in the medical field, the charity organization worker claims the whole field of dependence as his own. His or her work stops short at nothing that will aid in the rehabilitation of the individual or family in question.

It has already been pointed out that whatever is done for an individual in need must be done in such a way that the welfare of society is considered as well as the welfare of the individual. The family case worker should never weaken the economic and social forces that make for independence. In short, case work must not only "help the individual to live his life fully," but must help him in such a way as not to depress the independent efforts being made by other members of his community." [2]

[1] E. T. Devine, "The Practice of Charity," p. 71 (1901).

[2] Mary Willcox Glenn, "Case Work," *The Survey*, Vol. XXIX, p. 430 (1913).

"Sometimes, helping the individual may be objectionable, because it will injure other people. For instance, it is said that one reason of the very low wages of working women in Paris, which makes it impossible for any woman to earn a living there by needlework is the work that is done in institutions for poor women and sold at low rates—that is, those good people who have charge of institutions for poor women are possessed with a desire to maintain their institution and to teach the few women they have in them, that they injure thousands of working women for the sake of a few hundred they have directly under their

The technique of social case work falls naturally into two main divisions: Social Diagnosis and Social Treatment. Considerable space is given to a statement of the principles and methods of charity organization, as the technique of work with families as contrasted with work with neighborhoods, with groups of individuals, or with communities, constitutes in the writer's opinion the greatest contribution of the charity organization movement to social progress.[1] While the technique of family case work constitutes what is known as the recognized charity organization procedure, as previously pointed out, the methods are applicable with slight modification to the work of children's aid societies, societies to protect children from cruelty, probation departments, public relief offices, hospital social service bureaus, agencies for family relief, for home and school visiting, for mental hygiene work and other like organizations.

The necessity for a thorough mastery of the principles and methods of social case work cannot be urged too strongly. A whole life may be affected for weal or woe by a single decision in the plan of treatment. "For any given family there is only one best possible combination" of charitable resources to be utilized; "there are a dozen second-bests." [2]

In the explanation of the principles and methods of charity organization which follows, the writer has in mind what these principles and methods mean to the family

eyes, and this lowering of wages is one of the most disastrous effects of any extended relief system." Mrs. J. S. Lowell, *Charities Review,* Vol V, p. 390 (1896).

[1] It would be inaccurate to state that the C. O. S. movement alone has been responsible for the development of good "case work." Thus for example, one might cite the contribution of the Boston Children's Aid Society under the able direction of Mr. C. W. Birtwell. It is fair to state, however, that no other movement in the United States has done more or as much to develop the principles and technique of work with individuals and families as the charity organization movement.

[2] M. E. Richmond, "Some Methods of Charitable Coöperation," *Charities,* Vol. VII, p. 114 (1901).

case worker of to-day.[1] Such terms as investigation, coöperation, and adequate relief have a richer content for the modern social worker than they had for his predecessor of forty years ago.

SOCIAL DIAGNOSIS

I gave a beggar from my little store
Of well-earned gold. He spent the shining ore
And came again and yet again, still cold and hungry as
before.
I gave a thought, and through that thought of mine
He found himself, the man, supreme, divine!
Fed, clothed, and crowned with blessings manifold,
And now he begs no more.

—*Ella Wheeler Wilcox.*

"Social diagnosis is the attempt to arrive at as exact a definition as possible of the social situation and personality of a given client. The gathering of evidence, or investigation, begins the process, the critical examination and comparison of evidence follows, and last come its interpretation and the definition of the social difficulty." [2] The method of investigation is to open one's eyes to see, that of diagnosis to shut them to think. Where one word must describe the whole process, diagnosis is a better word than investigation, though in strict use the former belongs to the end of the process.

Social diagnosis is in short to the case worker what medical diagnosis is to the physician. Like disease, poverty is due to specific causes, and like disease though symptoms are similar, the causes may be widely different. Just as any rational plan of treatment in the field of medi-

[1] This should not be taken to imply that the accompanying explanation of principles applies universally to-day. Standards of work in some places still lag far behind.

[2] M. E. Richmond, "Social Diagnosis," p. 62 (1917). The publication of this monumental work makes less necessary as detailed a statement of the meaning of social diagnosis as would otherwise be in order.

cine is based on a knowledge of causes operating in the case in question, any adequate plan of treatment of an individual or family which has failed to be self-supporting must be based on a knowledge of the causes operating to produce that failure. Whether the cause is personal or not, or, as is often the case, both personal and social, common sense backed by experience has demonstrated that all treatment should be preceded by a knowledge of the essential facts involved. The end of social diagnosis is to ascertain the best possible thing to be done under a given combination of circumstances. Its purpose is to expedite, not cause procrastination in treatment, of which in truth it is a part.

Social Investigation

Investigation, the first step in social diagnosis, is an attempt to find out the causes behind the immediate situation in which a maladjusted family finds itself, in order to furnish the basis upon which to work systematically and persistently for the improvement of the condition of the family. Investigation means not only visits to the home but visits to relatives, employers, school teachers, ministers, friends, and others who have viewed the family from different vantage grounds. "The visits are made not only to gather information, but to get suggestions for, and help in carrying out a plan for betterment." [1]

Experience has shown time and again that thorough investigation is no easy task. Not only valuable but absolutely essential sources of information [2] are far more

[1] "What Is Organized Charity?" pp. 4 and 5, pamphlet published by The Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation (1910).

[2] The following give some idea of the variety of the sources of information that may be used: Church connections, either clergymen, fellow church members, Sunday-school teachers; landlords, both former and present; lawyers, medical agencies, including physicians, dentists, hos-

numerous and varied than the lay public would imagine and the methodology to be used in working these mines of information has a technique of its own.[1] Investigations made in early days are often seen later to be inadequate or unnecessarily elaborate. It is not at all surprising then, that investigations made by the charity organization societies as revealed on the old record cards, seem in the light of what has been learned by their blunders "childishly crude."[2] Charity organization workers are to-day rediscovering the value of scientific investigation. To be competent witnesses of actual facts is no small contribution to social progress. The present emphasis on thorough investigation is but natural in the

pitals and sanatoria, dispensaries, nurses, midwives, social service departments; neighborhood references, including former and present neighbors and former and present tradesmen; pawnbrokers; private social agencies, including C. O. S. or Associated Charities, foreign relief societies, other relief societies, home for adults, homes for children, Children's Aid Societies, S. P. C. C. or Humane Societies, day nurseries, settlements; public officials, including almshouses, charities department, health departments, court departments, juvenile probation, adult probation, municipal lodging houses, prison or reformatory, U. S. consuls, foreign consuls; public records, including records of birth, baptism, death, contagious disease, marriage, divorce or legal separation, property, guardianship, or insurance; relatives; school officials, including teachers, truant officers, medical inspectors and nurses, school visitors, fellow pupils; social, trade and benefit societies, including trade unions, fellow workmen, political clubs, benefit societies, and other clubs.

[1] Much of the work of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, under the direction of Miss Mary E. Richmond, consists of research, looking to the development of a scientific technique for the social case worker. The noteworthy contribution to this field, made by the director of the above mentioned department in the Kennedy lectures of The New York School of Philanthropy for 1913-1914 entitled "First Steps in Social Case Work," after amplification was published under the title "Social Diagnosis," already mentioned.

[2] Mary E. Richmond, "What is Charity Organization," *Charities Review*, Vol. IX, p. 496 (1900). Miss Zilpha Smith, one of the pioneers in the work of the Associated Charities of Boston and long its General Secretary, speaking in conversation with the writer, of Oscar McCulloch's report on Associated Charities at the National Conference of Charities and Correction of 1880, said that admirable though it was, the report shows a great difference in our early thought from now. It shows that much was later gained by a sympathetic understanding of the poor and their surroundings growing out of the use of the very methods stated therein.

light of the rapid strides that biology, psychology and the social sciences have been making in the past two decades. Stressing the social causes of poverty carries with it an added interest in searching them out through investigation. The situation is paralleled in the medical profession, the analogy between which and social work is strikingly complete. A well-known doctor [1] is reported as saying that twenty years ago a dispensary was not justified in spending much over ten minutes for diagnosis on the average case. The progress of therapeutics had not progressed far enough to warrant longer time. To-day because of the advance in the field of therapeutics, an hour may be the best investment for the ultimate sake of economy of time. Moreover, it may be an absolute necessity in the light of the advance made in the field of diagnosis with its blood tests and the like. The same change has taken place in the field of work.

It is quite within truth to say that social diagnosis of the kind which ceases being solely and primarily for the purpose of thwarting the expectations of impostors and which does more, not only determining that help should be given but also revealing from what sources such help should come and how agencies may be brought into definite and hearty coöperation in carrying out the necessary treatment, is something whose possibilities have only been gradually unfolded.[2]

[1] Dr. Charles Emerson.

[2] For those who wish to gain a more complete knowledge of the subject of investigation, the following readings are suggested:

M. E. Richmond, "Social Diagnosis (1917).

C. Birtwell, "Investigation," *Charities Review,* Jan., 1895.

M. F. Byington, "The Confidential Exchange," Russell Sage Foundation Pamphlet (1917).

E. T. Devine, "The Practice of Charity (1901).

Amelia Sears, "The Charity Visitor," New and Revised Edition (1917).

Helen Bosanquet, "Standard of Life" (1898), Chapter on "An Apology for False Statements."

Porter R. Lee, "Social Work with Families and Individuals," Pamphlet No. I, Studies in Social Work, issued by The New York School of Philanthropy (1915).

The Work Test

A work test is a device sometimes used to determine in certain cases where other means are impossible, whether a given individual is "work-shy" or not. In brief it is an aid in diagnosis. It most often assumes the form of a woodyard or a stone quarry. The disastrous results to good case work which the abuse of these agencies entails, entitles a discussion of the work test, brief though it must necessarily be, to a place in any presentation of the methods and principles of charity organization.

It should be borne in mind in the first place that a work test is neither a substitute for investigation nor a substitute for relief. When it becomes either, it reveals an ignorance of the meaning of social case work.

If a work test is to have any value it must combine three features: First, it must be simple so that no one can pretend to lack the skill to do it. Second, it must be reasonably severe, and yet not too severe for the ordinary strength. Third, it must be for "a fair wage and under conditions which do not tend to destroy a man's self-respect." " 'Doles of work' for 'doles of pay' does not fool men." [1] These features may mean that a society should have several types of tests. It should be possible for a society to pay "a fair wage" and offer the test "under conditions that do not tend to destroy a man's self-respect" if the work test is made what its name implies, a *test,* and not a substitute for regular employment. As a test it is temporary and, therefore, does not involve the expense incident to "made work."

[1] William H. Mathews, "Wages from Relief Funds," *The Survey,* Vol. XXXIV, p. 246 (1915).

Case Records

It is essential to keep an accurate record of the results of an investigation. It is also equally necessary to record the individual steps in treatment, taken in the light of the social diagnosis made. As the purpose of recording information concerning a family is to make possible the most expeditious and most effective care of the family in question, much time has been spent in planning a form of record which should effectively arrange all the information gained in such a way as to make it easy for workers and case conferences to get at all essential facts, in order intelligently to find a way out of the difficulty at hand.

In her suggestive book, "The Charity Visitor," Miss Sears makes the point that there are three uses to which the record may be put:

"1. To inform all subsequent workers of the facts gleaned concerning this family;

"2. To inform the public, through annual reports, of the work progressing in the society, thus making possible further work through the interest aroused;

"3. To accumulate data concerning poverty, disease, social exploitation and industrial abuse—data that may prove effective in securing a wider knowledge and hence the amelioration of the conditions, social, industrial and economic, that produce dependency." [1]

Covering respectively the third and second by-product of record making just listed, another student of the subject writes: The idea of keeping case records also includes "the expectation that presently these cases will furnish the body of facts which can show with more detail than can now be known the causes of poverty and of dependence. Likewise these case facts should serve to prove at once to doubters the justice of the pretension

[1] Amelia Sears, "The Charity Visitor," New and Revised Edition. p. 39 (1917).

that patient personal care, coupled with adequate material aid, can raise families out of dependence rather than merely keep them alive, as was done by impulsive giving or official relief." [1]

Certain it is, usefulness of case records is to be measured by their value (1) to the individual; (2) to the society keeping them, as a basis for reports to its benefactors and to the community of its stewardship; (3) to the community in arousing effort for the common welfare.[2]

The Development of the Registration Bureau

As the new societies were anxious to avoid the duplication of relief that so generally obtained and in some communities is still too prevalent, they were equally desirous of securing a registration of cases in which all societies working with the poor should take part. Accordingly one of the earliest methods of coöperation introduced by charity organization societies was a system of recording the charitable relief of various agencies at a central office, and of forwarding to these agencies in return all information received that was likely to be of service to them. The device was simply an adaptation to charity needs of the clearing house system. On separate cards were entered the names of

(1) all applying for or receiving official outdoor aid;
(2) all persons receiving aid in the institutions (indoor aid). These included the dispensaries, the hospital, the almshouse, etc.:

[1] Jessica B. Peixotto, "Reconciling Public and Private Relief," Second Annual Report of the Municipal Charities Commission, City of Los Angeles, Cal., p. 29 (1915).

[2] Rose J. McHugh, "The Meaning and Limitations of Records in Relief Work." A paper read at the fourth biennial meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, held in Washington, D. C., September 17-20, 1916. See also Ada E. Sheffield, "Social Case History, its Construction and Content" (1920).

(3) all persons relieved by associations, societies, guilds, churches or individuals, so far as they coöperate;
(4) all persons relieved by private charities, so far as can be ascertained;
(5) all persons in penal and reformatory institutions, and passing through the courts.

The cards about one family were brought together, each card representing the society or person reporting, and placed in an alphabetical file. Such a device served as a center into which was gathered information about particular families in order that it might be placed instantly at the service of any society or individual interested and about to take action. Such a registration bureau revealed duplication, overlapping of relief, and fraud. This however was but the smallest part of the service which it rendered. It saved both the stamina of families and the money of the charitably disposed, but its service to the charitable was not so great as its protection to the poor.[1]

From the day when the Boston Associated Charities took over as a normal part of its work a Registration Bureau already launched a few years previous by some volunteer relief workers, and began to collect from the various charitable societies of the city records of their "cases" and to register them, until 1906, the general plan of registration was the same wherever used.[2] During this time the Registration Bureau continued to be used chiefly by relief-giving societies. Gradually more agencies were being organized in the community whose services to the poor did not include the giving of relief. At first these agencies usually saw no reason why they should register. Finally it "became increasingly evident that their work

[1] See "What is Organized Charity?" a pamphlet published by the Russell Sage Foundation, p. 13.

[2] Boston began with reports merely of groceries, coal or shoes given. When the Associated Charities took over the work, it was found that information as to character, earnings, etc., was just as important as notices of relief.

with a given family would be unintelligent and superficial if they did not know whether others had dealt or were dealing with it." [1] A growing sense of responsibility for a case undertaken, fostered by the form of record used, and the growing popular use of the telephone with the increasing willingness to use it for confidential matters were big factors making for a more general use of the Registration Bureau.

The Development of the Social Service Exchange

Because it was felt by some of the agencies whom it was believed most desirable to encourage in registering their cases, that a recording of the life histories of their cases would be a violation of strict confidence, and because the Registration Bureaus where found, realized that the copies of their records were not always up to date and did not often give a full picture of the family, the plan was devised of registering at the bureau "identifying information" [2] only and referring directly to an agency already interested in a case, any one inquiring about the case in question. Thus the Registration Bureau of the earlier days of the movement has evolved into the Social Service Exchange and, to use technical terms, the social agencies of various communities no longer register their cases with the Charity Organization Society but "inquire of the Exchange" about all their new cases.[3]

[1] Margaret F. Byington, "The Confidential Exchange," p. 5 (1912).

[2] Such includes the names, ages and occupations of the members of the family group, names and addresses of relatives, and the names of agencies interested, with the date on which each inquired. It does not include any facts about family history or treatment.

[3] It would be erroneous to leave the impression that every community, even those with charity organization societies, has to-day its social service exchange. The idea originating in Boston in 1906, has, however, spread to a number of large cities, including New York, Philadelphia, Chicago and Cleveland. Such exchanges are not always conducted by the local charity organization societies but may be run by a committee representing the agencies dealing with needy families and dependent children or as an independent social agency.

Such an Exchange is as impersonal as a catalogue or city directory. The advantages of the new plan of registering are obvious, and offset its chief weakness of not providing for a notice to one agency of the reëntry into a case of another agency which had earlier dropped it. It has been found desirable at certain stages of development in a city trying the new plan, still to use certain of the methods of the old plan in order to get results.

The services of an Exchange are many and important. In the first place its universal use by all of the social agencies of a city would make unnecessary the representative of one organization asking questions that have already been answered to other social workers and digging up facts that have already been unearthed. Secondly, the Exchange provides a means of letting others know that an individual, a church, or another agency interested in a particular family may wish no interference.[1] Thirdly, it affords a means where several agencies are working with one family, to avoid the "bewildered and often dazed condition of mind" of those to whom they minister, "brought about by conflicting advice and variant plans; the uncertainty, the worry, the lack of confidence, the clever turning of one agency's attitude as a fence against another's,[2] the blocking of wise measures, [and] the not infrequent suffering . . ." [3] It should be pointed

[1] The most usual objection raised against the central registration bureau is that it violates the privacy of the dependent family by making its condition public property. On the contrary, registration safeguards privacy as noted above. "Index cards," writes the Assistant Secretary of the Buffalo Charity Organization Society, "are not public; no one but a confidential employee of the bureau is allowed to handle them, and with thousands on file a single card loses all individuality or prominence. Information is not given indiscriminately, especially over the telephone, but only to accredited inquirers." Anna B. Fox, "Focussing the Lines of Social Contact," *The Survey*, Vol. XXV, p. 1036 (1911).

[2] When as in some cities there are a thousand churches and when these give relief without first communicating with each other through an Exchange, they tempt the poor to deceive.

[3] Anna B. Fox, "Focussing the Lines of Social Contact," *The Survey*, Vol. XXV, p. 1036 (1911).

out in this connection that social work has an ethical code no less than medicine, and for much the same reason. The ethics of social work forbids one social agency interfering in the work of another agency. If the medical profession were to abandon this code of ethics, and several doctors paying no attention to the others, were to attempt to treat a patient at the same time, it is safe to predict what would happen.

Fourthly, the Exchange may become an effective agent for social reform. Its secondary registration on a street index for identification makes it possible so to map out the city that one can readily answer the question as to which neighborhoods of a city are most in need of improvement. As Miss Fox writes: "It would be difficult to name a single social movement that would not be aided by the data accumulated at a central bureau. The street directory there would show that certain localities of special interest to housing reformers, for instance, are likewise conspicuous in the registration from medical agencies, playground boards, and juvenile correctional institutions. The student of immigration or of racial groups would find there abundant material for study. Another benefit which would follow would be the inauguration of a more uniform and complete system of statistics by the organizations and institutions represented—one bearing upon the facts social investigators wish to find and rarely can." [1]

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the possibilities of the Social Service Exchange becoming an effective engine for social coöperation [2] are in inverse ratio to its being viewed as a mere business device which can be run by clerks whose employers so regard it. It must be under the direction of those who thoroughly understand social case work. Reports, telephone messages, letters, personal

[1] Anna B. Fox, "Focussing the Lines of Social Contact," *The Survey*, Vol. XXV, p. 1037 (1911).

[2] A leaflet issued in 1913 by the Social Service Exchange of New York forcibly illustrates this last point in showing that 30,000 families, including approximately 135,000 individuals, would in all probability be reported to the exchange during that year.

interviews, may all be merely expeditiously despatched, with the sole purpose in view of a more or less accurate checking up of lists. What is needed is something equally prompt, but far more intelligent and humane. "We are not satisfied," says the Boston registrar, "unless those who begin to use the exchange are induced to seek closer relations and a better understanding with other groups of workers in other lines of social work." "This is achieved," writes Miss Richmond, "by tactful suggestion, by watching avoidance of ground for misunderstanding, and by steady though gentle pressure towards the real ends in view. The ability to organize such an enterprise demands not so much clerical dexterity as social statesmanship." [1]

Coöperation

Neither social diagnosis nor social case treatment can proceed far without a community spirit of coöperation. Of necessity, coöperation has been the watchword of the charity organization movement since the beginning. While in the early days coöperation meant hardly more than mere good fellowship among social agencies and a possible agreeing not to overlap in the matter of relief giving, it has steadily acquired greater significance, until to-day it spells not only active "team work" among social agencies based on the idea of function, but also a working principle applicable to every act of the social worker. Coöperation in the pioneer days was desirable; to-day the division of labor in social work has proceeded so far that it is now a matter of life and death. The motto of the

[1] M. E. Richmond, "The Confidential Exchange," *The Survey*, Vol. XXV, p. 998 (1911).

For an excellent account of the development of the Social Service or Confidential Exchange see pamphlet, "The Confidential Exchange," by Margaret F. Byington, published by the Charity Organization Department, Russell Sage Foundation (1912).

THE CHARITIES CLEARING HOUSE

Will Connect You With Available Information From 30 Agencies Regarding 30,000 of Cleveland's Families.



ADDRESS ~ 501 ST CLAIR AVE N. E.
TELEPHONES ~ MAIN 5183
ERIE 112

New York society, "United, an army; divided, a mob," is appropriate for every charity organization society.

On the official side, coöperation means "that each of the coöperating individuals or societies shall supplement the efforts of the others contributing a part of the money or work needed; or it may mean that they will agree to a division of work, each leaving to the other a part for which its facilities are adapted; or it may mean a division of the cases to be dealt with, each agreeing to leave entirely to the other certain classes of individuals or families whose needs are to be studied and adequately met by the agency to which they are assigned." [1]

"Coöperation among charities, like all relationships," writes Porter R. Lee, "is a process of give and take. As long as social work is in a tentative stage, there will be different standards in different agencies, different ways of meeting similar problems. The response of other organizations for coöperation will not always be what is expected. Demands upon an organization may exceed its financial resources or its legal powers. Its experience, with the full force of which other agencies are unfamiliar, may dictate policies which at first sight seem unreasonable. One cannot expect others, however, to concede the validity of his experience in his own field unless he makes a similar concession to them. Those who attempt to cooperate with other agencies, as all social workers must, may well consider in this connection those factors which make any human relationship run smoothly and with satisfaction to those concerned." [2] Certainly a big step is taken in any community toward social coöperation when each agency is on the lookout to make its coöperation with other agencies better than is asked.

Coöperation on the official side, as it concerns the rela-

[1] E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," p. 347 (1905).

[2] Porter R. Lee, "Social Work with Families and Individuals," *Studies in Social Work*, No. 1, issued by The New York School of Philanthropy, pp. 14-15.

tions of social agencies, is still very important, but cooperation has more than an official side. It is also such a "habit of mind" as leads a worker to see, in the discharge of his particular duties, all those conditions which need to be remedied, and then if they do not fall within his or her particular province, to interest in them those other social agencies to which they more directly belong. The attitude of the worker with this conception of cooperation is "that of being in turn a representative of the various agencies, and of bringing to the family the services of each as they are needed." [1] This, the highest type of coöperation, must be based upon agreement as to principles and such agreement is a matter of slow growth.

As difficult as it may be at times to secure effective cooperation, it cannot be iterated too forcibly that in just the proportion that a charity organization society secures coöperation in the field of its endeavor, may it be said to be measuring up to the true test of efficiency, for without coöperation the organization of charity is manifestly impossible.[2]

The District Plan

It will not be necessary to describe the forms of organization found among various charity organization societies. There is, however, one feature characteristic of all, except the smaller societies, which is so important as to merit special attention.[3] This is the district plan of

[1] Amelia Sears, "The Charity Visitor," p. 13 (1913).

[2] "The best way to deal successfully with destitution is to have as many as possible of the individuals, societies, and churches that are interested in the charitable work of the community *allied together* in the committees of the Charity Organization Society." "What is Organized Charity?" p. 8, pamphlet published by the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation.

[3] Those societies which laid emphasis from the start upon the district plan include Buffalo, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington.

work, the district being the unit of organization through which the constructive work of the society on behalf of needy families is done.[1]

Under the district plan of organization the city is divided up into what Dr. Chalmers called "manageable portions of civic territory."[2] The attempt is made to break up the complex and unneighborly city into units that are neighborhoods, with all that the term implies. Under the plan, investigations are made, reports sent and all contacts with those of the district needing help are made by a salaried agent of the society (often called district superintendent), or one of his or her assistants, who is assigned to the district in question. The general office of the society, so far as the treatment of residents goes, merely sees that applications for aid which come to it reach the proper district, and that there is uniformity in work throughout the districts according to the aims of the society.[3]

While a charity organization society may consider poverty as its problem and an interest in its causes as essential, the first concern of the district office is not the problem of poverty in the abstract but the study of the helpful resources, personal, civic, industrial, of the neighborhood

[1] In the smaller societies where it is not necessary to divide the territory to be covered into districts there is nevertheless usually a committee whose functions are identical with the district committee of the larger cities.

[2] It is always possible to reduce the size of districts until they once more become really "manageable portions of civic territory." As a matter of practice, however, the size of districts among the various charity organization societies of the country vary greatly. For example, some of the districts of the Chicago society have under their care as many families as the combined districts of the Buffalo Society. Boston is divided into sixteen districts, while Chicago, covering a considerably larger area, has less than ten.

[3] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "District Charity Organization," *The Charities Review*, Vol. VII, p. 595 (1897).

[4] That there should be enough centralization to make the workers in the various districts feel that they are all part of a big system and enough to secure uniformity in the quality of work done is borne out by the conditions obtaining in Philadelphia until 1900, when the work of reorganization of its district system was begun. The so-called "Philadelphia system of independent districts" is now thoroughly discredited.

and of the city behind it, in order to be able to use any available for the solution of the problems of each poor family in the neighborhood.

The advantages of the district plan of work are several. Beside affording a unit of territory that does not paralyze effort because of the size of the tasks it represents, the district plan makes possible a spirit of neighborliness, a large element in all true charity. A neighborhood feeling may be made into a definite asset, into a real social force. The capable district superintendent "reads the interplay of social forces within his district as from an open book and no impatience with the mischievous and evil tendencies working therein can blind him to the human and hopeful side." [1] Furthermore, the district office may supply a meeting place for all interested in the social needs of the neighborhood and so be the means of developing still further a real neighbor spirit of cooperation and self-help.[2] It is in the conferences of the district committee that the habit of thinking and planning together is formed. The actual working together of individuals over small tasks, breaking down prejudices as it does and imparting better ideals of charity, thus becomes an important aid to coöperation. It was the district form of organization which gave additional emphasis to the fact that the new movement was no rival charity but a step in the direction of greater coöperation.

Moreover, the district office is near enough to all in the district that those in need of advice or assistance are saved the burden of car fare and time that a journey

[1] M. E. Richmond, "Some Methods of Charitable Coöperation," *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 113 (1901).

[2] Certain district committees of the New York Society, for example, have been instrumental in organizing neighborhood associations. While not organically connected with the district committees, many of the same people are interested in each.

See also a description of "The House of Social Service in the Chicago Stockyards District," by Mary E. McDowell, *The Survey*, Vol. XXXV, pp. 344-345 (1913). This building not only houses the United Charities of the Stockyards District but a half dozen or more social agencies working in the district.

to a central city office would often entail. If the object of the society were negative, if it wanted to discourage its use by those in need of help this might prove an advantage. It need hardly be pointed out that such is foreign to the whole spirit of charity organization, just as making its service inaccessible is contrary to the ideals of visiting nursing or other public health movements.

Finally, the district plan justifies its greater financial cost by its gain, not only in coöperation but in the number of volunteers it is able to attract. Each district becomes an additional center for winning volunteers.[1]

The Case Conference

The district committee which meets in case conference at least weekly is composed usually of residents of the district. The ideal committee is "one in which a small number of people who come faithfully meet very many others who come from time to time, to talk out what can be done for families in which they are interested." [2] Such a committee includes persons from many vocations and walks of life, men [3] as well as women, that an all-round point of view may obtain.

The function of the case conference is, after hearing the reports of the professional workers as to the results of their investigation, to aid in the diagnosis of the more difficult family problems as they arise from week to week in the work of the district. The conference coming new to the problems laid before it often exhibits a freshness of thought and vitality of interest that is remarkable. It is in a position to see the issues involved

[1] In the sixteen districts in Boston there is but one paid agent in each. Much responsibility is carried by the volunteers.

[2] "Organized Charity at Work," *The Charities Review,* Vol. X, p. 564.

[3] It is sometimes found desirable to have the case conference meet in the evenings that men may attend in larger numbers. For an account of a Men's Conference see "Report of the Charity Organization Society of New York City for 1912," p. 37.

in truer proportions than those who have wrestled first-hand with the problem from day to day. The collective experience of a group of mature and thoughtful persons is certainly a valuable asset to the district workers.

A function of the case conference never to be overlooked is the educational. Discussion is an approved educational process, and the case method of teaching is one gaining increasing recognition. No group of thoughtful and conscientious people can attend the conferences from week to week without acquiring a fund of information and insight into life and social forces to be gained in few other ways. The educational possibilities of the district system of work are not limited to the volunteers. In societies where the district secretary is in full charge of the district (except finances) the district secretaryship becomes an excellent training school for positions of larger administrative responsibilities in the charity organization field.[1]

Daily Committee Work

Some societies, notably the Boston Associated Charities, have instituted daily committee work. By a system of "daily committees," a small number of members of the district case conference in turn come daily to the district office to confer with the secretary concerning families under care. It is the custom to have several of the older and more experienced visitors present each day. This informal contact with other visitors, especially the older ones, is suggestive and reassuring to the new recruits. These sessions of the daily committee are not "stiffened by the intangible formality of a conference." Three persons can discuss far better than twenty. This daily committee work brings visitors into such a relation with others' work in the district as to make them feel re-

[1] The Chicago district plan, for example, has been noteworthy in the number of strong executives that it has developed.

sponsibility for making suggestions about it. In short, it "aids all the work, makes the conference meetings more helpful and the visitor's own service better." [1]

SOCIAL CASE TREATMENT

If a man give me aught, he has done me a low benefit; if he enable me to do aught of myself, he has done me a high benefit.

—*Ralph Waldo Emerson.*

In charity organization work as in other forms of social case work it is impossible to separate diagnosis from treatment. Much that is discussed under one heading might just as appropriately find a place under the other. This is notably true of "Coöperation," a subject already discussed but which shall again claim our attention.

Social case treatment consists in organizing the social forces or resources of a community, including the latent powers in the individual or family to be helped, in such a fashion that a permanent cure or solution of the difficulty may be effected if humanly possible.

To one with training and imagination the social forces in any community capable of organization are legion. They include "personal forces," neighborhood forces," civic forces," "private charitable forces," "public relief forces," and above all, the "forces" within the particular family to be helped. For a detailed statement of the nature of these forces, see the diagram on page opposite.[2]

[1] Zilpha D. Smith, "The Education of the Friendly Visitor," *The Charities Review*, Vol. II, p. 51 (1892).

Those interested in the details of organization and methods of work of district committees will find the following valuable:

"The Wheels of Organized Charity" (The Work of a District Committee) issued by the Charity Organization Society of Buffalo, 3d edition (1918).

Mary Willcox Glenn, "The City District in Charity Work," *The Survey*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 1264-1265 (1911).

[2] Mary E. Richmond, "Charitable Coöperation," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 28th session, p. 300 (1901).



DIAGRAM OF FORCES WITH WHICH THE SOCIAL WORKER MAY COÖPERATE

A.—*Family Forces.*

Capacity of each member for
- Affection.
- Training.
- Endeavor.
- Social development.

B.—*Personal Forces.*

- Kindred.
- Friends.

C.—*Neighborhood Forces.*

- Neighbors, landlords, tradesmen.
- Former and present employers.
- Clergymen, Sunday-school teachers, fellow church members.
- Doctors.
- Trade-unions, fraternal and benefit societies, social clubs, fellow-workmen.
- Libraries, educational clubs, classes, settlements, etc.
- Thrift agencies, savings banks, stamp savings, building and loan associations.

D.—*Civic Forces.*

- School-teachers, truant officers.
- Police, police magistrates, probation officers, reformatories.
- Health department, sanitary inspectors, factory inspectors.
- Postmen.
- Parks, baths, etc.

E.—*Private Charitable Forces.*

- Charity organization society.
- Church of denomination to which family belongs.
- Benevolent individuals.
- National, special, and general relief societies.
- Charitable employment agencies and work-rooms.
- Fresh-air society, children's aid society, society for protection of children, children's homes, etc.
- District nurses, sick-diet kitchens, dispensaries, hospitals, etc.
- Society for suppression of vice, prisoner's aid society, etc.

F.—*Public Relief Forces.*

- Almshouses.
- Outdoor poor department.
- Public hospitals and dispensaries.

The two outstanding features of the accompanying diagram are, first, the wealth of social resources ready at hand in most communities but often overlooked, and second, the order in which the various "forces" are listed. It is no mere chance that "family forces" stands in the innermost circle and "public relief forces" in the outermost one. To the wise case worker the potentialities of each individual or family is the first resource to be used. If people are to be enabled to develop their own capacities, and that is the only true help, then whatever the case worker does must be done *with* the individual instead of *for* him.[1] His active coöperation must be secured and retained, or much work will be in vain; or worse, it will, as Charles S. Loch points out, tread on the soul while administering to the body.[2]

It is possible, moreover, to do much harm by turning first to forces labeled "E" or "F" before utilizing those found under "B", "C" and "D". It is well to recall in this connection the main object lesson of Chalmers' work in Glasgow that every community contains within itself a great invisible relief fund.[1] Good case work requires not only the utilization of local social agencies, but also the unorganized social spirit to be found in all communities. The wrong order in the use of the various forces listed may readily be the means of pauperizing the family in question by killing individual initiative and weakening family ties. In times of industrial depression there is the added danger of so increasing the work of the agencies represented by "E" and "F" as to swamp them, with the resulting lowering of the standards of their

[1] "In nothing" (in the practice of charity) "would the change seem so marked as in our willingness to coöperate with the poor themselves and with their neighbors." Mary E. Richmond, "Charitable Coöperation," Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, 1901, p. 308, reprinted *Charities,* Vol. VII, p. 197 (1901).

[2] C. S. Loch, "One Man's Waste, Another Man's Want," *Charity Organization Review,* Vol. XIV (new series), p. 170 (1903).

[3] See p. 35.

work and consequent harm to those for whom their services are primarily intended.

Organizing Charity

"Why need we organize so sweet a thing as charity? We organize music which would otherwise be discord. We organize religion. Without organization, charity would be to a large extent waste and error."

—*Annual Report of the Buffalo Charity Organization Society.*

It must not be inferred that the foregoing social "forces" are to be utilized singly. To the contrary, effective social treatment implies working out the combination of forces best suited to the needs of the individual or family in question. With many of the foregoing forces the skilled case worker must coöperate simultaneously if the goal, restoration to normal life in the community, is to be attained. It must never be overlooked that there is only *one* best combination of forces for each family, though there may be a dozen second "bests." The meaning and method of *organizing* charity is so well illustrated by the following condensed case history and by the chart that they are reproduced here in full.

"On the first day of December, 1909, as this man walked along the street upon his crutch, a gentleman, noting his crippled condition, stopped long enough to tell him to go to the Associated Charities. 'The gentleman said they might help him' was as definite as he could make his appeal.

"A kindly interview brought out the facts that he was thirty years old, and had a wife and three small children. Until a year previous he had worked on a farm, when he lost his leg by an accidental gun-shot wound. Coming into town, for he could no longer support his

family in the country, they were all living in one small room, rented from the wife's sister, herself a poor dressmaker. The wife worked in a factory and was earning $4.50 a week. The husband took care of the children.

" 'Why couldn't your wife stay at home with the children, do sewing, and let you find some light work?' he was asked.

" 'She can't see to sew, and it makes her eyes hurt,' was his reply.

"Let us set down the rest of the story step by step, just as an agent of the Associated Charities brought it about:

"An oculist examined the wife's eyes.

"An optician gave her the glasses.

"An institution supplied temporary employment to the man, at which he proved his willingness to work.

"Relatives cared for the children while both parents worked.

"A shoemaker agreed to take the man in his shop and teach him the trade.

"A Sunday-School class provided money equivalent to the wife's earnings so that she might care for the children while the man served his apprenticeship in the shoemaker's shop.

"A public hospital treated both husband and wife during temporary sickness.

"A dentist cured the wife's neuralgia by treating her teeth.

"The same Sunday-School class guaranteed the cost of a shoemaker's outfit for the man and paid rent while he was building up a business.

"Numbers of individuals were found to give him work.

"The result has been that this man paid for his outfit and is now making three times as much as his wife formerly earned. The oldest child is in school, and has done so well that he has been advanced in his grade. In short, a hovel has been made into a prosperous home." [1]

[1] The Fifth Annual Report of the Associated Charities of Atlanta, Georgia, pp. 11-15.



It is the function of a Society for Organizing Charity to find the right combination in each instance.

Adequate Treatment

"I used to be taught as a child that I must not water my garden unless I were prepared to do it thoroughly, for that to sprinkle the surface of the earth caused the plants to turn their roots upward in search of moisture instead of striking deeper down into the firm, moist soil below, then when the drought came they perished. So with the unfortunate people who are subjected to sprinkling charity, they are always on the lookout for the little gifts which come dropping casually in, and they never get a chance of developing resource and self-reliance."

—*Helen Bosanquet, "Rich and Poor," p. 182.*

Adequate treatment, as just illustrated, means doing for and in coöperation with an individual or family all those things revealed by a careful investigation, and a skillful diagnosis as necessary for the rehabilitation of the individual or family in question. They may be few and quickly completed, or many and take much money and years of service. In either event the adequacy of the treatment depends upon a comprehensive and coördinate plan of action. Adequate treatment must not be confused with adequate relief. Adequate treatment may or may not involve the use of gifts of money or goods. Adequate treatment is a far bigger and more difficult task than adequate relief.

The old view of charity was to see mainly the immediate conditions and resulted often in helping people *in* their poverty. The new view studies the applicant's whole situation, in order to discover how many and how varied his disabilities may be, and at the same time, looks for every weak place in the organization of the family of which he is a part in order to strengthen it. In short, it aims to help people *out* of their poverty and to keep them out. Such treatment includes not only the bread-

winner, whose temporary sickness may have been the occasion for turning to a charity organization society, but extends to every member of the family, including the youngest child, who is viewed as the potential head of a family, whose foundations are now being laid in his or her education or lack of it; in his or her health or ill-health; and in his or her moral stamina or lack of it. In short, adequate treatment means not half measures but helping thoroughly, carrying through resolutely, a plan no matter what the expense. It implies always the long range point of view, the attitude of mind that looks ten or fifteen years or even longer into the future.

The elements of adequate treatment are becoming increasingly numerous but at the same time increasingly definite. With the relation of poverty to physical disease becoming clearer, a change has naturally followed in the conception of adequate treatment. Studies in standards of living including such items as recreation and opportunities for spiritual advance as well as food allowances for healthy children, have opened case workers' eyes as to what constitutes the cost of normal family life. The development of mental hygiene is causing still other changes not only in social diagnosis but in our conceptions of adequate social treatment.

In short, it may be said, that all charity organization workers are to-day agreed that treatment that is adequate is always characterized by the long range point of view, that it has as its highest aim the understanding and improvement of character or at least the avoidance of anything that would weaken character, and that though it may not raise the standard of living of the family helped above the definite minimum standard which satisfies the public sentiment of the community, it does not on the other hand lower it.

Personal Service

"I have sometimes been asked by rich acquaintances whether I do not remember the words, 'Never turn thy face from any poor man.' I cannot help thinking that to give *one's self* rather than *one's money* to the poor is not exactly turning one's face from him."

—*Octavia Hill.*[1]

"A helping hand is one thing, an open hand is another."

—*Edward T. Devine.*

The biggest single factor in social treatment is what for want of a better term is called personal service; by which is meant the knowledge, judgment, patience and inspiration that goes into every well thought-out and effectively executed plan for rehabilitation. The acid test of such service is that it result in another man's ennoblement.

The following incident from the day's work of one society is illustrative:

"She was dressed in black, a woman whose strength lay in her repose; whose quiet personality bespoke the competent mother. She had come to the Central Office of the Society.

" 'I would like to speak to some one who knew Miss Henry,' she said.

"Miss Henry died nine years ago.

" 'I have not been in this building since that time,' continued the woman, 'but to-day I felt that I ought to tell some one in the Society what Miss Henry did for me.'

"Then she said that fifteen years ago she had come under the care of the Society's Gramercy District, of which Miss Henry was secretary. With the gentleness of one who has ceased to reproach the past, the woman

[1] Quoted in the Tenth Annual Report, Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity (1888).

told how when she was twenty-one years old she had learned that the man to whom she had been married was a bigamist. He had deserted her and her three children. In the shock of this crisis she thought herself convicted of immorality. Life seemed hopeless and she began to drink.

"Then Miss Henry found her, convinced her of her innocence, steadied her, saw that the money needed to keep the family together was provided, and later found her work so that for years she had been self-supporting. The children are now grown up and are contributing their share toward the income of the household.

" 'Miss Henry not only saved my home,' concluded the woman as quietly as she had begun, 'she saved my soul.' " [1]

The further one gets from the conception of the "Economic Man," of the classical economists of England, and the nearer to an understanding of the "Whole Man," the less is the importance that one attaches to orders of groceries in social case treatment and the greater is the significance one places on that form of personal relationship which puts one in touch with opportunities and is best described as friendship. Life demands of all, knowledge that is not covered by the three R's or imparted in even the most modern of schools. Personal service must supply the deficiencies for thousands who are for one reason or another unadjusted. The relationship in some ways is that of teacher and taught. As with many other educators the teaching is not all done by one side.

Volunteer Service

One of the most characteristic features, if not *the most* characteristic feature, of a charity organization society is its use of volunteer service.[1] The fact that such

[1] "Charity Organization Bulletin," No. 156 (Dec. 27, 1916), published by the Charity Organization Society of New York City.

[2] In a public address in Philadelphia in 1915, Miss Richmond at-

societies constantly try to increase rather than diminish the proportion of their work that is done by unpaid volunteer workers is not surprising to one who understands their aims.

No contrast between the charitable thought immediately preceding the initial stages of the C. O. S. movement and that which followed, stands out more clearly than the importance placed on volunteer service. It was advocated not merely as a means of improving the poor and their condition but as a means of educating the charitably disposed individuals, the men and women who are willing to give either time or money or both for the relief of distress. The emphasis which the new movement laid on a first-hand knowledge of the problems of poverty and on intercourse with the poor thus revived and brought into wider use a method of educating the well-to-do, already discovered by Chalmers in Glasgow [1] and Tuckerman in Boston.[2]

Volunteer service covers a wide range of activities, including office work, service on special committees, attendance at daily or weekly case conferences and friendly visiting, a discussion of which will presently claim our attention. The variety of opportunities for service means a place for many kinds of talents.[3] The charity organiza-

tributed the fact that the number of charity organization societies had more than doubled during the past ten years to the emphasis laid on volunteer service.

[1] See pp. 33-38.

[2] See pp. 70-76.

[3] Writing of the whole field of social work, Dr. Devine concludes an appeal to college graduates for service in the following words: "The ultimate social message is a call to volunteer service. The points of attack are many: the rehabilitation of broken families, the protection of threatened young girls, the guidance of young boys whose habits are forming, the prevention of such exploitation as that of the loan sharks, the abolition of the local jail, the socializing of police systems and of educational systems, the stamping out of infectious disease, the social control of abnormal heredity, the maintenance of reasonable standards of living—and other tasks, some of which are easier than these. In all of them it is easy to go astray from lack of preparation, and in all of them there is full exercise for those powers of the soul which the college has called into conscious existence." Editorial, "Social Forces," *The Survey*, Vol. XXVI, p. 468 (1911).

tion society is thus a means whereby all those who can contribute time or money or both may make their benevolence beneficence. Such service may be made both democratic and efficient. It is a means of extending the work of the society and in addition brings to the paid staff not only the stimulus of the non-professional worker but also the added protection of having to explain one's work and justify one's decisions to those who come with a fresh point of view and with whom there is the normal horror at abnormal conditions. The continual and unrelieved succession of one abnormal situation after another must necessarily have a warping effect upon the judgment.

"There was a time," writes a former president of the National Conference of Social Work, "when leaders in social work inclined to the belief that the constructive social work of the country would have to be left in large measure to those who made a vocation of social service. Such an attitude was natural and, at the time that it was held, was helpful. While professional standards of work were first being formulated and tentative efforts were being made to establish a living wage for members of a professional social staff, the emphasis had to fall heavily on the importance to the field of the professional, whole-time worker, even though the emphasis tended to belittle the value of the volunteer, or part-time worker." [1] Such emphasis had the additional value of helping to make clear the fact that there must be some preparation for service, no matter what the conditions of service are, but now "has come an enlarged appreciation of the demand for a social force that shall be representative of all sections of the community—of all races, creeds, classes, interests—that shall include those who have money, those who have service, those who have both to give, and those who give themselves without stint, whether or not there

[1] Mary Willcox Glenn, "A Prelude to Peace," *The Survey,* Vol. XXXIV, pp. 200-201 (1915).

be made any partial payment for services rendered."[1] This, however, should not be taken to mean that willingness to help is in itself a qualification. Intelligence, discretion, and general dependableness are as indispensable here as elsewhere. "Therefore it is better to have it understood at first," writes Miss Richmond, "that, paradoxical as it may sound, volunteers are not expected to volunteer, but that they will be asked to work as they are needed. To be asked to volunteer, then, becomes something of a distinction, and any possible sentiment of doing the society a favor by serving it is eliminated."[2] The most successful continuous work is usually done by volunteers acting under intelligent leadership, and with a trained paid agent.[3]

To sum up, there are at least four good reasons for the use of volunteers. First, professional or better "vocational" workers alone can never give all the personal service needed in a community; nor should they unless one imposes on the paid staff of a charity organization society a responsibility it never claims. This does not mean, however, that volunteers should ever be used merely for sake of economy. Second, the volunteers may bring a freshness of vision and enthusiasm to their work which is contagious and invaluable to the work of the whole society. Third, each volunteer means for the society just one more vital contact with the community. Such contacts provide intelligent channels of enlightenment and constructive criticism. Fourth, but not least, where there are the largest number of volunteers coming into first hand and constant touch with the disadvantaged groups, there you are likely to have a more intelligent interest in the poor and the causes of poverty. Each

[1] Mary Willcox Glenn, "A Prelude to Peace," *The Survey,* Vol. XXXIV, p. 201 (1915).

[2] M. E. Richmond, "The Case for the Volunteer, *The Survey,* Vol. XXIX, p. 423 (1913).

[3] There is grave danger in having volunteers in high executive positions. If they lack judgment, it is hard to control them and to remove them from office.

volunteer becomes in a sense an educator in matters that make for the good of the whole community.

Volunteer Friendly Visiting

Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.

—Saint Paul.

Not what we give, but what we share,
For the gift without the giver is bare.

James Russell Lowell.

The need for friendship and neighborliness is so great in a large city or even in a smaller community that charity organization societies develop friendly visiting as a fundamental part of the personal service they render to many of their families. Personal influence over one hundred and fifty to two hundred families in charge during a year's work is not possible for a district secretary. Such a secretary may be an excellent guardian but only in rare instances can he or she be a friend. Such work is therefore almost always part of the work of volunteer or avocational workers, and hence the above caption.

"Every one interested" (in the inadequacy of mere almsgiving) "ought to read the story of Edward Denison and all that Octavia Hill has to say of the vast sums which the wealth of London has poured into its haunts of misery, and the futility of it all until a *something else* went with the money,—or went without it."[1] An appreciation of this truth early led charity organization societies to stress the importance of establishing a permanent personal relationship between a family in distress and some volunteer who would act as a friend.

As there is apparently much misunderstanding, both in

[1] Fanny B. Ames, "Adequate Relief vs. Dole-giving," *Lend-a-Hand*, Vol. I, p. 227 (1886).

and outside the ranks of social workers, as to the essential nature of friendly visiting, it will save confusion to define the term at once. "We are friendly visitors when we call upon our immediate neighbors. In visiting the poor we are simply enlarging our circle of friends, and the responsibility of friendship. We are not to burst upon those of our acquaintance who happen to be poor with advice, moralizing, inquisitiveness or gratuities. When we first meet them we are strangers, and must show the respect due to persons upon whom we have no claim. We are just as much strangers to them as if we knew nothing of their affairs, and we should show them some reason for our first visit. We are almost sure to be welcomed. Perhaps we can do nothing more than perform our errand and suggest calling again. Illness or little children or some chance occurrence may give us an opportunity to get faster upon good terms. In any case let us remember that, as nothing springs from nothing, we must ourselves be frank, courteous, patient, sensible, and really friendly, if we are to inspire like qualities in those we seek to influence. Example will do much more than preaching. What we are, and not what we do, counts most." [1] Friendly visiting is not, in the language of another [2] well qualified to speak on the subject, "wise measures of relief, it is not getting the children in school or training them for work; it is not improving sanitary arrangements and caring for the sick; it is not teaching cleanliness or economical cooking or buying; it is not enforcing habits of thrift or encouraging healthful recreations. It may be a few of these things or all of them, but it is always something more. Friendly visiting means intimate and continuous knowledge of and sympathy with

[1] "The Friendly Visitor," leaflet published by the Associated Charities, Washington, D. C.

[2] "Miss Richmond, in 'The Good Neighbor,' has given the best exposition of what may be called the orthodox charity organization view" of friendly visiting, writes Mr. Devine editorially in *Charities and the Commons,* Vol. XIX, p. 1636 (1908).

a poor family's joys, sorrows, opinions, feelings and entire outlook upon life." [1] Friendly visiting thus differs from all other kinds of charitable visiting in that it is continuous, and in that while other social workers may come into contact with many families on one side, the friendly visitor learns to know a few families on many sides and expects to form a permanent relation. The friendly visitor is the personal embodiment of the slogan of many societies, "Not alms, but a friend."

The contributions of a real friendly visitor are many and involve no sense of moral superiority. "I think," writes Dr. Devine, "that we may quite safely throw overboard once and for all the idea that the dependent poor are our moral inferiors—that there is a necessary connection between wealth and virtue, or between poverty and guilt—as we have already thrown over the opposite idea that in poverty alone there is some peculiar merit." [2] Often the thing most needed which the friendly visitor can supply is knowledge—and courage and cheer,—knowledge how better to run a house, or for a widow, how best to handle a boy inclined to be a rover; courage and cheer to face these numberless complications of every life which in some instances become complicated beyond their worst.

The relation of friendly visitor is not one to be lightly entered into. It is not for a temporary crisis, but involves continuous relationship that may extend over years. The visitor that has this view of his or her place in the organization of charity," writes Miss Richmond, "is unlikely to blunder either about relief, or any detail; without it, he is almost certain, in any charitable relations with members of the family, to blunder seriously." [3]

[1] M. E. Richmond, "Friendly Visiting Among the Poor," *Charities Review*, Vol. IX, p. 42 (1899).
[2] E. T. Devine, "Economic Aspects of Material Relief," *Charities*, Vol. XI, p. 541 (1903).
[3] M. E. Richmond, "Friendly Visiting Among the Poor," *Charities Review*, Vol. IX, p. 43 (1899).

A friendly visitor is neither a social diagnostician nor an almsgiver. "The visitor goes not as a judge, almoner, trustee or capitalist, but as one who, having had limited experience in the trials of life and methods of overcoming them, endeavors to apply such experiences in aid of a fellow-being who had had less favorable opportunities." [1] His or hers is the high office of friend. It is in this capacity that he or she gradually gains personal knowledge of family resources, tastes, ambitions, and gradually also that personal influence which counts for most in moulding the lives of all and on which the finest type of social case work depends. It is in this sense that friendly visiting is frequently referred to as the "soul" or "flower" of charity organization.

It is sometimes urged that friendly visiting is misnamed, as friendship can grow out of only the so-called normal relationships of life. Real affection cannot be forced or created and does not come in response to command or as a result of economic or social convenience. While this may be true, it is urged in reply that such did not prevent the Good Samaritan from aiding the man who fell among thieves and was thereby neighbor unto him. Furthermore, it is the conviction of many who have had experience with friendly visitors that the capacity of most people for friendship is greater than they themselves imagine.[2] The late Professor Shaler has pointed out a very encouraging fact about human beings, when he tells

[1] W. J. Breed, "The Obligations of Personal Work in Aid to Right Structure of Character," *The Charities Review*, Vol. II, pp. 67-70 (1892).

[2] The superintendent of friendly visiting of the St. Paul A. C. records as follows certain definite results of the relations established between the visitors and the families:

"I see the acquaintance begun with hesitancy and misgiving on the part of the visitor, and with questioning and misunderstanding on the part of the visited, ripen into one of confidence, trustfulness and hopefulness. I see the children and young people of these poor homes slowly becoming accustomed to the welcome offered them in the homes of their new-found friends, and in some instances becoming frequent guests therein. I see them being taught useful industries. I see tired mothers turn with gratitude and words of praise to young women who cheer

us that "the revolt we feel at the sight of a man who is grievously wounded, or has any sore affliction which makes him appear abnormal, passes away as soon as we lay a helpful hand on his body. Something of this dissipation of the instinctive prejudice to the apparently inhuman nature of the neighbor will take place when a person of well-trained sympathies . . . vigorously goes forth to the sufferer by exercise of the will." [1]

Along with a real knowledge of life which a friendly visitor needs, must go the sympathetic understanding and robust optimism that spells courage to the discouraged and strength to the weak. And this must be crowned with such a spirit of humility as will lead one "to walk for many dreary miles beside the lowliest of His (God's) creatures, not even in the peace of mind, that the companionship of the humble is popularly supposed to give, but rather with the pangs and misgivings to which the poor human understanding is subjected whenever it attempts to comprehend the meaning of life." [2] In brief, wherever friendly visiting has succeeded, it has done so in direct proportion to the degree that there was an absence of condescension and a presence of the attitude of mind found in simple, whole-hearted neighborliness.

"What charitable visitors need," writes Dr. Devine, "more than money in their purse, is faith in their poor, humility of spirit, jolly comradeship, sheer psychic power

their homes and tenderly minister to their feeble offspring. I see the eyes of invalid mothers brighten when the cheerful friends make frequent calls. I see young women becoming companions to those who need an older sister's counsel and support. I see the heroic efforts of visitors who are trying to lift to the purer atmosphere of self-dependence those whose low standard of life accepts pauperism and beggary. I see earnest visitors carrying a real heart sorrow that as yet there is no evidence (outward) of better impulses in stubborn, intemperate or wayward lives." Anon., "Organized Charity at Work: St. Paul," *Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 490 (1900).

[1] N. S. Shaler, "The Neighbor: the Natural History of Human Contacts," p. 32 (1904).

[2] Jane Addams, "The Subtle Problems of Charity," *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. LXXXIII, p. 178 (1899).

to carry conviction for the right and sensible action against every argument springing from discouragement or bitterness or suspicion; from ignorance or stubbornness or weakness; even against such plausible arguments as arise from the very virtues and sound instincts of the poor." [1]

The relationship involved in friendly visiting, if its full possibilities are realized,[2] is a reciprocal one, for those below the poverty line have lessons to teach as well as those above it. Speaking of the tenants of her improved London cottages, Octavia Hill writes: "I must add in gratitude that I have much to thank them for. Their energy and hope amid overwhelming difficulties have made me ashamed of my own laziness and despair. I have seen the inevitable results of faults and omissions of mine that I had never sufficiently weighed. Their patience and thankfulness are a glad cause of admiration to me continually. I trust that our relation to one another may grow better and nearer for many years." [3]

The part that friendly visiting plays in treatment varies markedly throughout the country. Most of the societies have had difficulty in finding able and willing visitors. Many have almost given up their use for this reason. Doubtless one element in the situation is due to the rapid growths of our cities, causing them to spread over wide areas and resulting in a wide geographical separation of the homes of potential friendly visitors and those most in need of their neighborliness.[4] It is to this same geographi-

[1] Edward T. Devine, "A Mediæval Efficiency Test," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXI, p. 597 (1914).

[2] Not all personal service is effective. It may be unquestionably personal and also very mischievous.

[3] Octavia Hill, "Homes of the London Poor," Reprinted by the New York State Charities Aid Association, publication No. 8, p. 4 (1875).

[4] For example, in Chicago the two axes of the city are 27 miles by 11 miles. In a city three to four times the size of Boston, transportation alone is no inconsiderable factor. Boston, on the other hand, has retained a simpler way of living and looking at life than is found in many cities of its size. There obtains there an unusual willingness of all classes to take hold and coöperate.

cal separation that the social settlement movement, which took root in the United States in 1887, owes its origin. Immigration with its resulting foreign quarters in many American cities has often raised barriers, not only geographical but racial and social, including differences of language—barriers which though not insurmountable, have nevertheless increased the difficulty of friendly visiting.

Aside from the difficulties just enumerated, there are other factors which explain the relatively greater success of some societies in friendly visiting than others. A lack of any real effort and skill in the continuous organizing of friendly visitors is bound to give poor results.[1] Too often a visitor appointed to a family goes his or her own way, fails or succeeds on his or her own knowledge. It is a misuse of the friendly visitor to send such with little or no training and without a plan to a family with whom experts may have already failed. A big element of success in all friendly visiting depends upon choosing visitors with care, realizing that some people by temperament and experience have a genius for friendship, and that every one's value in any line of activity increases with training. Accordingly training classes and group discussions for friendly visitors should be an integral part of the work of the society. At such regular conferences the visitors gain an understanding of the problems confronting them through association with other visitors, and are made to feel their responsibility and that as a trained group of workers whose advice is valuable they are a vital part of the work. Asked the reason of Boston's exceptional progress in this branch of the work, Miss Zilpha D. Smith, then general secretary of the society, replied that in so far as conditions differed in Boston from other places, "the difference is that somebody in the conference

[1] As one of the workers in the Boston Associated Charities tersely put it, "Once the A. C. gets you, you are lost. It never lets go of you. For a district superintendent to lose a volunteer is viewed as as big an error as to go wrong on a case."

has the power of organization and does that work. That is the secret of it all. That is what our local conferences are for. If they be fully successful there must be two or three persons in them who have the power of holding things together and fitting them to their places. It requires patience and tact. . . . You have not only to learn the characteristics of the poor, but of all your visitors." [1]

In short, if volunteer visitors fail it is probably "because it is assumed that good visitors are born good visitors." [2] There may be born good visitors but "certainly most of the good visitors in any group are *made*." [3]

Relief

Relief as it is here used refers to the material aspects of treatment. It is the medicine that a physician may prescribe in the course of his treatment, in which it may have an important but often secondary part. It is a means to an end, never an end in itself. Unlike medicine it is valuable only as it has a vital relation to family life, on its mental and spiritual sides as well as the physical.

It is now almost axiomatic to add that whatever relief is used should be adequate. This may involve a few or a few hundred dollars. Only a real understanding of the

[1] See Proceedings National Conference of Charities and Correction, 12th session, p. 482 (1885).

[2] Zilpha D. Smith, "Discussion of Friendly Visiting," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 28th session, p. 405 (1901).

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 405.

For further references see:

M. E. Richmond, "Friendly Visiting Among the Poor" (1914).

M. E. Richmond, "The Good Neighbor in the Modern City" (1908).

M. E. Richmond, "Friendly Visiting," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 34th session, pp. 307-315 (1907).

Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 28th session, pp. 398-408 (1901), being the minutes and discussion of a section meeting on Friendly Visiting. Miss Zilpha D. Smith, Chairman.

Porter R. Lee, "A Visit to the Boston Visitors," *Charities*, Vol. XVI, pp. 589-592 (1906).

needs of normal family life in each particular case can decide the amount that is adequate.

As greater and more accurate knowledge is acquired of what is needed for each family's physical, mental and spiritual health, it is apparent that the amount of relief deemed adequate at an earlier day no longer meets the new tests. Relief administered with no standards of adequacy means poor food, room overcrowding, lodgers when there is no accommodation consistent with propriety, the sending of the mother into industry even where there are still small children, and child labor. Such relief but continues the vicious circle of poverty, pointed out by Rowntree in his study of poverty,—poor food meaning poor physique, poor work, poor wages and again poor food. In its right place "money can be made quite as spiritual in its effects as the alms of good advice." [1] Certainly "inadequate relief is torture and temptation." [2] The possible harm of relief giving is "much modified," as Jane Addams has well observed, "where it goes (as it often will under the district plan) not to strangers but to acquaintances, or rather, may we not say, to friends, for the friendship of a friendly visitor should be reciprocal." [3]

The difficult question in regard to relief is not so much when to use it as to decide the right amount in a given instance. Fortunately an increasing number of scientific studies of standards of living is reducing the margin of doubt by standardizing what was otherwise personal opinion or guess work as to quantity and quality of food, clothing, shelter, recreation, etc., necessary to maintain physical and spiritual efficiency.[4]

[1] Frederic Almy, "Constructive Relief," *The Survey*, Vol. XXVII, p. 1265 (1911).

[2] A motto used in the letters of appeal for funds for individual families in need by the Charity Organization Society of New York City.

[3] See Frederic Almy, "Coöperation of Churches in Charity," *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 205 (1901).

[4] For example the various scientific studies of food values (Atwater and others), of family budgets (the earliest United States study of value being as late as 1901), and studies of standards of living such as that of Chapin

An interesting question is raised as to the position of a charity organization society in a district where the standard of living is below the accepted American standard for the country at large. There is in each community a definite minimum standard of living which satisfies the public sentiment of that community. Charitable relief is concerned not with raising or lowering that standard, but rather with eliminating the obstacles which particular individuals and families have in realizing the standard, and in securing the withdrawal from the industrial class of those who are unfit for a place in it.[1] "No charity organization society," writes Dr. Devine, "can announce that it has adopted a standard of $750 for the average family, and that henceforth all incomes below that amount will be supplemented by such an allowance as will bring them up to this standard. Such a policy would tend not only to financial bankruptcy, but to a far more serious bankruptcy of character." [2] The responsibility for paying a living wage rests squarely on the shoulders of industry. This is in harmony with the same writer's objection to relief to a family in which an able-bodied man is earning, or able to earn the current wage, even if that wage is too small.[3] Such a procedure would be tantamount to supplementing wages with charity, thereby helping to keep wages down below the level which permits of an adequate family standard of living. This does not mean that charity organization societies are not interested in vigorously calling attention to the

(1909). The Report of 1906-07 of the Committee on Standards of Living of the New York State Conference of Charities and Correction influenced the conception of adequacy of relief, at least in the state.

In addition to the increase of such information as the foregoing the conceptions of protected childhood and the growing interest in matters of public health have influenced the current view as to what constitutes adequacy of relief. As one worker expressed it, "The health movement has increased our budget 30 per cent."

[1] See E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," p. 38 (1904); also "Efficiency and Relief," p. 17 (1906).

[2] E. T. Devine, "Social Forces," an editorial, *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XIX, p. 1083 (1907).

[3] E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," p. 21, also p. 24 (1904).

evil effects of inadequate wages.[1] The low wages of women and children are in some cases supplemented by charity organization societies, but earnest efforts are usually made to encourage the employer to pay a fair wage, agents of the society not infrequently calling upon the employers of under-paid widows and children, and, failing to secure better pay for them, helping their clients to secure other jobs.

While it is customary in administering relief to bear in mind the previous standard of the family in question, there are certain cases where the standard sought in treatment means an increase in the expenditures of the family over that obtaining when independent of charity. This is often necessary in order to maintain physical efficiency. It is always, however, restricted to those families where continuous charity is called for covering years, where the family is responsive and the earnings of the family group and the contributions of relatives not relaxed.[2] As to the wisdom of this, owing to the possible harm that such a practice may have on society at large, authorities differ.[3]

As to whether a family needing relief should receive the same in money, in goods, or in orders on certain stores, practice varies. The weight of opinion seems to be in favor of relief in money, it being held that to deprive a person of the function of spending is to make that person poor indeed. The purchase of each of the three great necessities of life, food, clothing, and shelter, is an opportunity for self-development. The purchase of each

[1] See pamphlet, "My Money Won't Reach," being the findings of a study of 377 Self-supporting Families in New York City, published by the New York Charity Organization Society, April, 1918.

[2] See Frederic Almy, "Constructive Relief," *The Survey,* Vol. XXVII, pp. 1265-1266 (1911).

[3] For both sides of this general question, see Homer Folks, "The Care of Needy Families in Their Homes," *Charities,* Vol. VII, p. 416 (1901); Editorial, *Charities,* Vol. VII, p. 420 (1901); Frederic Almy, "Standards of Living as Standards of Relief," *Charities and the Commons,* Vol. XXI, pp. 1127-1129 (1909); Francis H. McLean, "Standards of Living Again," *Charities and the Commons,* Vol. XXI, p. 1008 (1909).

of these has a dominant psychological benefit, that of food being barter, that of rent being foresight, and that of clothing being self-expression.[1]

In answer to the objection that a society can purchase more economically than the client because of wholesale rates or greater wisdom, the irrefutable answer is that the first interest of social work should be to save families rather than money. If the family is not taught how to administer its finances by experience, it will have little chance ever to learn.[2]

Sources of Relief

The first source of relief of charity organization societies is kindred, neighbors, friends, in short, the "invisible relief fund" found in every community. Often these natural sources are soon exhausted and the problem of supplying relief from other sources becomes imperative. Four methods of meeting this situation, obtain among charity organization societies, either singly or in combination.

I. The Case-by-Case Method.
II. From Relief Societies.
III. From General Funds Maintained by the C. O. S.
IV. From Public Funds.

[1] For an excellent exposition of this thesis see "Food, Shelter, and Clothing," by Emma A. Winslow "Home Economist of the New York Charity Organization Society," *The Survey,* Vol. XXXVII, pp. 45 and 46 (1916).

[2] For further study see:

Frederic Almy, "Relief," a Primer, Russell Sage Foundation Pamphlet.
Porter R. Lee, "Treatment," Russell Sage Foundation Pamphlet.
Frederic Almy, "Adequate Relief," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 38th session, p. 281 (1911).
M. E. Richmond, "Adequate Relief," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 38th session, p. 292 (1911).
M. E. Richmond, "Friendly Visiting Among the Poor," Chapter IX (1899.)
E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," Part I, Chapters II, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XV (1904).

In addition to the above, a fund for emergency relief is almost universally maintained by charity organization societies, so that all immediate needs may be met within twenty-four hours pending a social diagnosis. Sometimes such a fund is maintained by a committee to which it is understood the society may turn for emergency needs.[1]

The Case-by-Case Method

The case-by-case plan of raising money for relief purposes is a distinctive feature of charity organization societies.[2] The method is one most often used for those families where the prospect is that relief will be needed for some time. In the larger societies it is usual for the district committee or conference to ascertain the total income of such a family and the amount needed in addition, to maintain a reasonable standard of life. The case then comes to a central committee on appeals. This committee, before attempting to secure the pension, makes sure that the natural resources have been exhausted, that physical defects of children have been rectified, that examination for tuberculosis has been made, that school attendance is being kept, and that a friendly visitor has been secured—or at least that efforts to secure such a visitor are being made.[3] Usually a representative of the district committee is present at the meetings of the central committee when the case of a family in which it is interested is discussed. The committee on appeals then raises

[1] In New York City, for example, there exists the Provident Relief Fund, the trustees of which stand ready to supply immediately upon the request of agents of the Charity Organization Society emergent and temporary relief in cases in which relief has to be supplied before it can be obtained from other sources.

[2] This method of finance was first put on a systematic basis by the Philadelphia Society about 1901, through the establishment of a Special Appeals Committee. This feature of the society's work has since been widely copied.

[3] Roy Smith Wallace, "Field Work for Special Funds," *Charities*, Vol. XIX, p. 1426 (1908).

the necessary money by means of letters or personal visits to those whose interest they believe that they may be able to enlist in the family in question. In some places the committee makes appeals not only to individuals but draws into closer coöperation smaller relief agencies such as King's Daughters circles, and church aid societies.[1]

Through the case-by-case method a charity organization society utilizes the actual and potential relief that is to be found in every community. Such unorganized relief has no office or headquarters of its own except as the local charity organization society supplies it. Moreover, the case-by-case method, though sometimes troublesome, has the immense advantage of enforcing family ties and neighborly duties instead of relaxing them. It is also an effective means of educating the giving public in principles of relief.

From Relief Societies

There are good historical reasons why a non-relief policy was often advisable in the earlier days of the movement. When the first charity organization societies were formed, "the antagonism of the old relief-giving societies was frequently aroused; for the latter thought they saw in the new movement a likelihood of the duplication of their own efforts, which would be mischievous in its influence on the poor, and embarrassing when appeals were made to contributors. . . . A charity organization society with a relief-fund must necessarily compete in its appeals to contributors with other organizations giving direct relief to the poor. These organizations are consequently apt to be jealous of it, and may not coöperate willingly, either in aiding cases it brings to their attention, or in giving to it and obtaining from it information of common advantage." [2] In some newer

[1] "Special Fund for Special Cases," *Charities,* Vol. XIX, p. 920 (1907).
[2] A. G. Warner, "American Charities," pp. 384-5 (1894). "The result

and smaller communities relief societies did not exist before the founding of the local charity organization society. The tendency in such instances was for the new organization to acquire a general relief fund. It would have been an advanced position for the time if it had done otherwise.

There are reasons of a serious nature why to-day the weight of authority is opposed to a charity organization society maintaining a general relief fund of its own.[1] Such a relief fund, it is urged, is likely to become a kind of crutch on which the society is liable to lean instead of organizing the charitable resources of the community, including those residing in the individual or family to be helped.[2] The existence of a relief fund, it is further maintained, tends to obscure the higher purposes for which charity organization should stand. "If the best societies," writes Dr. Devine, "have kept free to a considerable extent from these dangers (perfunctory investigation, routine relief, etc.), and have constantly renewed the high

of trying to combine charity organization work with relief giving in Philadelphia," writes Prof. Lindsay in 1899, "has been a competition between the charity organization society and four relief societies which have ample funds. The relief societies do not coöperate with each other, nor with the charity organization society, and it now seems impossible to arouse any interest in the community sufficient to support a society doing purely charity organization work. So there is much duplication and waste of energy and money and the poor are injured rather than benefited. Samuel McC. Lindsay, "Problems of Charity Organization Workers," *Charities Review,* Vol. VIII, p. 522 (1899).

[1] "The sentence, 'It is not the business of this Society to furnish relief, but to seek relief for worthy persons,' should be graven on the minds of all. It cannot be too clearly nor too frequently impressed on the subscribers, directors, officers and applicants. Experience warrants us in saying that any compromise with this principle is fatal to the largest usefulness possible to a Society." Samuel McCune Lindsay, *Charities,* Vol. II, p. 4 (1899).

[2] Robert Treat Paine for years President of the Boston Associated Charities, believed that the restriction of their society which forbade the giving of alms by visitors resulted in training a body of experts who were very skillful in devising other methods of succor. *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. I, p. 230 (1886). He gives elsewhere three other reasons why visitors must refrain from giving alms: (1) to give wisely requires special training; (2) the best welfare of the poor is the controlling consideration; (3) friendly relations are often spoiled by the hope of larger alms.

standards and the intelligent methods which, at the beginning, as we have seen, have characterized other movements for the better organization of charity as well as their own, this happy result is due in a very large measure to the single fact that they have not themselves directly disbursed relief. As an investigating and relief-obtaining agency, it is constantly necessary for the C. O. S. to justify its decisions to others to secure their assent and win their approval. As an agency for promoting coöperation it is necessary for the society to appeal strongly and convincingly to all branches of the charitable public. It has not the temptation to become sentimental, and its work can be kept upon a broad basis of common sense, honest dealing with facts at first hand, maintaining a due proportion between various kinds of charitable needs, and shunning those forms of charitable activity which win easy but fleeting popularity."[1, 2] In like vein, Frederic Almy writes, "Pre-collected relief, or a large relief fund which it is easy to dip into, is especially dangerous, and leads to lazy work in developing the natural resources of families in need. So far as possible, relief should be hand-picked for each family."[3] Certainly it is urged in some instances, "relatives, employers, or others upon whom the applicants have recognized personal claims should be given the first opportunity to aid." [4]

A further objection is raised by Miss Richmond, who

[1] Edward T. Devine, "Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes," *Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 306 (1900).

[2] Amos G. Warner takes a similar stand against relief giving. See his "American Charities," footnote p. 386 (1894). As regards the wisdom of encouraging a small society to begin with a pre-collected relief fund, the experience of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation and of the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity is instructive. Briefly, the individual society that does not follow the general development of the movement in its individual development does not achieve even the beginnings of family rehabilitation. From a conference with the Director of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, 1914.

[3] Frederic Almy, "Constructive Relief," *The Survey*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 1265-1266 (1911).

[4] Anon., "Organized Charity at Work: The Massachusetts Tramp," *The Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 493 (1901).

maintains that there is an "unfortunate psychological effect of a large relief fund upon the imaginations of the charitable," which seems "to be almost as clearly defined as is the operation of Gresham's law in the world of finance and as little capable of being set aside." [1] If such a fund is known to exist in a community, it is contended, it soon acquires in the popular mind the attribute of being inexhaustible. Cases requiring charitable assistance are dismissed from mind by referring them to the C. O. S., which is held to exist for "just such work." It is a debatable question whether if this habit of mind is created in a community toward its charitable obligations any charity organization society with a general relief fund may not sooner or later be swamped by the demands made on its treasury.

The fundamental question raised by this last objection is whether relief should be *centralized or decentralized,* whether it should be concentrated at one point or be distributed more evenly throughout the community. If for example a person has handled a case until he or she reaches a point in treatment where twenty dollars is needed, such a person should be taught to carry the case a step further and raise this fund rather than expect an agency to carry all such burdens.[2]

From General Funds Maintained By C. O. S.

The belief that a charity organization society should never maintain a general fund has not gone unchallenged. It is maintained by those who oppose this view that for a community to have a general relief society and a charity

[1] M. E. Richmond, "What is Charity Organization?", *Charities Review,* Vol. IX, p. 493 (1900).

[2] During 1914 many charity organization societies throughout the country faced deficits ranging from $2,000 to $80,000. In the case of the society with the greatest deficit, a large factor in the deficit may have been that the entire financial responsibility of cases needing assistance has been thrown on it by the community on the plea that it maintains a general relief fund.

organization society means inevitably a certain amount of overlapping of machinery and overhead charges in the community's social equipment. It is urged that it is difficult if not impossible to "get the interest and coöperation of the business men, the people who give," so long as there is a diversity of functions between a charity organization society and a relief society. It is claimed that a C. O. S., which is an out-and-out relief society, gains much more understanding and support in its community than is otherwise possible.[1] It is further maintained that "everything the Charity Organization Society aims to accomplish and everything the relief society aims to do can be accomplished by one society, which will work on a plan of incorporating the good points of both systems."[2, 3] Those who question the wisdom of always

[1] "Twenty-five Years and After," *Charities and the Commons,* Vol. XIX, p. 1130 (1907).

"Much inadequate relief comes because the money is not in sight," writes Frederic Almy, "and the money is not in sight because of inadequate relief. Why not warm the cockles of the public heart which finds us cold?" See article, "Constructive Relief," *The Survey,* Vol. XXVII, p. 1266 (1911).

Mr. Almy's reasoning seemed to be borne out by the testimony of the Orange Society. Writing of it in 1902, Mr. A. W. McDougall says: "The relief work done by the Society has distinctly strengthened its position in the community. It is safe to say that it never would have had the strong hold which it now really has upon the sympathies of the people, if it were not that it had shown a readiness to give relief when it was necessary. It has avoided all the antagonisms that arise from a theoretical discussion of relief giving. People learn by object lessons rather than by theoretical discussion." *Charities,* Vol. IX, pp. 336-337 (1902).

[2] Discussion by Frank Tucker of a paper on Relief Associations and their Relation to Charity Organization Societies, read by Philip W. Ayres, Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 26th session, p. 366 (1889).

[3] "Relief-giving was omitted from the work of the first charity organization society for special reasons, but the conditions do not seem to have made it possible for the societies in the United States to follow the original plan with success. The effort to do so has undoubtedly led to some confusion of thought and waste of energy. As the prevailing methods are so widely at variance with what has generally been considered the standard, it would be wise to revise the principles of charity-organization societies upon this point to suit local conditions and prevent harmful misunderstanding.

"Their real duty consists in impressing upon the minds of the public the fact that material relief is only the preliminary step in the process of regenerating the individual, a step that under some circumstances

separating the function relief-giving from all other lines of restorative effort go even further and declare that such a division is unnatural and to some extent impracticable. "The agency which makes the investigation and undertakes the continuous work of bettering the conditions found is not only best able to judge of the relief which may be necessary but must feel the responsibility of seeing that the necessary relief is given. The very fact that unnecessary relief is deprecated impels the Charity Organization Society to see that prompt and adequate relief is given when the necessity for it actually appears, and in actual practice it transpires that every charity organization society has relief at its disposal either from its own funds or from those of some affiliated agency."[1] Finally it has been asked why, if relief-giving is dangerous, "should relief societies as such, and their contributors, bear all the onus of relief-giving? Why should there be the separation between the expenditure of material relief and the necessary accompanying treatment which is entailed by the fact that the relief and treatment are given by different and independent societies, which may not have a common problem in any particular case?" [2]

It is apparent in the arguments here advanced that their supporters put aside the fact that much relief is to-day raised by the case-by-case method and that more

need not be taken at all; that constructive work which shall develop the individual beyond the need of alms is the supreme aim. It is in the emphasis of the latter rather than in the denial of the former function that the charity organization society will fulfill its true mission." C. M. Hubbard, "Relation of C. O. S. to Relief Societies and Relief-Giving," *Amer. Jour. Sociology,* Vol. VI, pp. 786-787 (1901).

[1] "There are both advantages and disadvantages in depending upon the coöperation of affiliated agencies for the supply of relief, but the disposition of the Detroit Conference was to look upon the choice as a matter of local adaptation, and of secondary importance. The matter of primary importance is the maintenance of a high standard of professional service in this field of work." Quotation in text and foregoing from a report of The National Conference of Charities and Correction of 1902, signed by D. I. G., *Charities,* Vol. IX, p. 17 (1902).

[2] Samuel H. Bishop, "A New Movement in Charity," *Charities,* Vol. VII, p. 447 (1901).

could be, and that further, the belief exists in more than one quarter that if a community were to create anew its social machinery it would not be the part of wisdom for it to create "relief societies." Such societies are the heritage of the social thinking of an earlier generation. It is obvious to the thoughtful student of the movement that those who take the former view have the immediate needs of the poor uppermost in mind, while those who take the position just advanced hold that the fundamental principle of the charity organization society is to help the poor by the education of the public in wise and adequate charitable methods.

Irrespective of the merits of the questions just raised, whether a particular charity organization society to-day maintains a general relief fund of its own has depended in the main upon the extent to which in the past it could obtain relief for its cases from the existing agencies of its community. Thus, while relief-giving was omitted from the work of nearly all of the first charity organization societies, by 1904, as will later be seen, about one-half [1] of the charity organization societies of the country were giving relief from their own funds. Of the remaining half some gave relief only in case of great emergency; some were the regular channel for such relief; still others pursued the case-by-case method, already described.

The Relationship of the C. O. S. to a General Relief Society

Whenever general relief societies exist in the same communities with charity organization societies, interesting and sometimes difficult questions arise as to the relationship that should obtain between the two organizations. Some have concluded that the most satisfactory

[1] Robert W. deForest, "The Federation of Organized Charities," *Charities*, Vol. XII, p. 21 (1904).

relation is found when the relief society is relatively passive, not because it must be, but because its confidence in the efficiency of the charity organization society makes it willing to abide by its acts and follow its advice. To those who hold this view, the relief society should ordinarily serve as a repository of a relief fund, much of which will be expended as the charity organization society's needs require. Any extension of its activities should be along lines not covered by the charity organization society such as fresh air work, savings banks, etc. The charity organization society, those who hold this view maintain, should keep to its special task, which is primarily family planning. This, they argue, is in harmony with progress in all lines of human endeavor, namely, "differentiation of function." In spite of the foregoing, relief societies that are city wide in operation have not been willing to accept the rôle of relief giving alone, with the result that they have either merged in the course of time with the local charity organization society or taken on the functions of a C. O. S.[1]

From Public Funds

Because of the rising standards of adequacy in relief, the budgets of many societies have increased at an unprece-

[1] In Chicago and Baltimore the two societies have been merged. In Boston the two societies have existed side by side with apparently such close coöperation that there is apparently no overlapping in machinery. In St. Louis the relief society finally added the functions of a charity organization society so that to-day there is but one general society in that field. In New York City, the two societies exist side by side, involving a minimum but still an inevitable amount of overlapping in the social machinery of relief of the community. Until 1900 the New York A. I. C. P. supplied material relief for certain cases of the N. Y. C. O. S. when the former organization adopted a rule that no relief would be given to any family unless it were placed in the sole charge of its own relief department. This action compelled the development of other sources of material relief for such cases on the part of the Charity Organization Society, and to this extent to the multiplication of relief agencies. From the point of view of the Charity Organization Society this was regarded "as disorganization of charity—as an unfortunate step backwards." Anon, "The A. I. C. P.," *Charities*, Vol. VI, p. 20 (1901).

dented rate during the last decade. Many societies have been forced to face constant deficits. This, along with other reasons, has led more than one society to work for such measures as Workmen's Compensation and Health Insurance. Such measures will mean a lessening of the financial burden now often placed by industry or society at large upon charity. Other ways out of the difficulty include agitation for more adequate public appropriations for widows' pensions, and a reorganization of public outdoor relief as a fund to be drawn upon by qualified social agencies, in connection with their work. There is, finally, the plan found in a few places of state subsidy of private agencies, an arrangement, however, often bitterly criticized.[1] This may be accomplished by supervisors of the poor paying to the local charity organization society a fixed monthly sum for the support of its work, or as in one place, by the city council contracting with three private societies, including the charity organization society, to carry on the relief work of the city. The overhead costs and general expenses are in this instance paid by the city, leaving to each of the three privately managed societies the duty of raising for itself from the general public any money required for direct relief.[2]

Financial Federations

A word is in order in regard to a method of raising funds from private sources that is at present a subject

[1] "No private association for organizing charity should receive any subsidy from the public funds of the city, county, or state. The very breath of life of such an association is the confidence of the community in which it works, and it will best keep that confidence only when it must look to the community for voluntary support. When a society solicits contributions it hears all the complaints that are made about itself, and to be compelled to listen to these is the first step either in showing its unsoundness or in correcting the faults on which it is based." Amos G. Warner, "Coöperation with Public Authorities," *The Charities Review*, Vol. II, p. 24 (1892).

[2] Jessica B. Peixotto, "Reconciling Public and Private Relief," Second Annual Report of the Municipal Charities Commission, City of Los Angeles, Cal., July 1, 1914-July 1, 1915, p. 32.

of interest to those both in and outside charity organization circles. This is the method of a joint collection of funds for all or nearly all the social agencies of a community. The usual arguments for such federations, the details of whose organization vary, are that they avoid annoyance to business men from many separate solicitations, that the collection of funds is easier, and that competitive finance is wasteful. Financial federations, it is further urged, result in greater coöperation in social work, more givers, larger contributions and social education. A special committee to study the whole question was appointed by the American Association for Organizing Charity in 1915. After an exhaustive study of the movement for city wide financial federations, and an examination of the arguments given above, the committee reporting in 1917 reached the following conclusion.

"The abolition of competition in the financing of social organizations for the sake of avoiding its waste is as attractive a proposition in theory and apparently as logical as the abolition of competition in business, which is championed in part on the same grounds. But in the social field, whether we agree or not regarding the economic field, there are spiritual and psychological factors which leave doubts as to the ultimate advantage to be derived from giving up a plan of work which has behind it the experience of more than one generation of social workers, in order to adopt one which, according to many who are in a position to know, is still in its experimental stage." [1]

Since the publication of this report the movement for the joint financing of social agencies has taken a number of steps forward and many of the earlier objections have been successfully answered.[2]

[1] Financial Federations: The Report of a Special Committee, American Association for Organizing Charity, p. 67 (1917).

[2] For later developments see pp. 428-436 of this study.

CHAPTER VI

BEGINNINGS OF THE MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

The roots of the charity organization movement in America extend deep in the soil of social and economic conditions. The industrial revolution had helped flood America with immigrants. Local workshops gave way to factories and mills organized on national lines. The centralization of production resulting from the development of steam changed the city from "a back eddy of immigration into an increasingly powerful magnet for cheap labor." [1] By 1884 there had been such an increase in urban population that it was estimated that 35% of the population in the East was to be found in cities, 15% of the population of the West, and 7% of the population of the South.

The influence of such concentration of people on the practice of charity is far-reaching. There is no solvent of social ties like urban life. Life in the city robs man of his natural relation to his fellows. The isolation of the poorer and better circumstanced classes prevents the easy solution of the poverty problem that is possible in more primitive communities where the personal relationships still exist and the poor and rich attend the same churches and partake in large measure of the same community life. The complexity of city life causes the individual to be lost in the mass, and it becomes increasingly difficult for charity to assume the normal channel

[1] R. W. Bruere, "The Good Samaritan, Incorporated," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, Vol. CXX, p. 836 (1910).

of personal service and personal gifts common in the country and smaller towns.[1] Moreover, with increasing density of population the individual has less and less power to control his environment. Escape from the influence of neighbors becomes impossible, and as we descend the scale of income the degree of interdependence becomes greater. Congestion of population aids in the spread of vice and infectious disease. There is no escape from the ignorance and selfishness of neighbors.[2]

In the light of the foregoing it is not surprising that when in 1873 there occurred one of the worst panics and one of the most protracted periods of industrial depression in American history, there was created a problem of unemployment and suffering unprecedented in extent and degree. Multitudes were thrown out of work. Their ranks were augmented by those soldiers of the Civil War, who had not yet found a place in the industrial life of the nation. There was an increase of tramps. For the first time unemployment as a national problem faced the country.[3] The period proved in many cities the heyday of soup kitchens and bread lines, the usual measures first adopted by a generous public still untrained in the expression of its charitable impulses.

The extraordinary drafts on the charity of individuals and of communities ultimately led to an examination of the prevailing methods of relief. This disclosed the fact that the methods of charity obtaining were almost incredibly wasteful and inefficient and led finally to the launching in the seventies of a number of charity organization societies. The simple old ways of helping the needy of colonial America could no longer meet the new needs.

[1] Robert W. de Forest, "What is Charity Organization," *The Charities Review*, Vol. I, p. 4 (1891).

[2] For a fuller discussion of this point, see L. F. Rowe, "Problems of City Government," pp. 72-73 (1908).

[3] In 1857 New York City witnessed the spectacle for the first time in America of American skilled laborers roaming the streets of their city, and existing on the free soup of charity. The problem, however, had not reached national proportions.

Interest in the problem of poverty which the new movement betokened was part of an awakening general interest in social problems. In 1865 was launched the American Social Science Association, the first association of size to deal with questions of charity and correction. In range of its plan of discussions, which included "the sanitary conditions of the people, the relief, employment and education of the poor, the prevention of crime, the amelioration of the criminal law, the discipline of prisons and the remedial treatment of the insane,"[1] it was a forerunner of the National Conference of Social Work.[2] While there were but few national organizations for social betterment launched before 1870,[3] the interest of the American people in the decade which saw the birth of the charity organization movement, assumed national proportions in the important problems of the criminal, the insane, the feeble-minded, the licentious, the drunken and the destitute. The seventies also witnessed the first awakening of concern as to public sanitation and the use of leisure by boys and young men.[4]

[1] Jeffrey Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 78 (1903).

[2] The National Conference of Charities and Correction had its formal beginning as a subcommittee of the American Social Science Association in 1874. It began its independent career in 1878 under the leadership of Frank B. Sanborn of Massachusetts, A. E. Elmore of Wisconsin, and F. H. Wines of Illinois. In the earlier years it was attended almost exclusively by state boards of charities. In 1917 it changed its name to the National Conference of Social Work. To-day the conference with its membership of some five thousand representatives of all phases of social work, and an attendance of three to five thousand at its annual meetings has no counterpart in any foreign country.

[3] Those still in existence are the American Medical Association, the National Education Association and the Superior Council of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul.

[4] Mary E. Richmond in a pamphlet entitled "The Inter-Relation of Social Movements" (p. 2), lists the following national organizations then in existence (1910), which date from the decade of the seventies: The American Prison Association, the Association of Instructors of the Blind, the Public Health Association, the National Conference of Charities and Correction, the American Purity Alliance, the National W. C. T. U., the American Academy of Medicine, the American Association for the Study of the Feeble-Minded, and the International Y. M. C. A. See Bulletin No. 17, Social Service Series, American Unitarian Ass'n.

Above all, it should ever be remembered that the pioneers of charity organization in America would have had far to travel to reach the point where they began, had not other pioneers on both sides of the Atlantic blazed the way and in doing so made substantial contributions to the fund of knowledge of the scientific principles of relief.

There were at least three places in the United States in which the charity organization movement had almost, if not completely independent origins—Germantown, a suburban ward of Philadelphia, Boston and Buffalo. There were other beginnings, but there are evidences that they more or less consciously followed in footsteps already taken elsewhere in the country.

The Germantown Experiment

During the winter of 1873, as a result of the depression precipitated by the failure of Jay Cook, of Philadelphia, many of the factories and workshops of the city were closed. Continual were the calls at the back doors of the well-to-do for food, money and help. The year previous there had come to the charge of the Unitarian church of Germantown one Charles Gordon Ames, who had already read the writings of Thomas Chalmers and Octavia Hill, and who was familiar with the reported experiences of the Elberfeld system of poor relief. "So," writes Alice Ames Winter, in describing the origin of the Germantown society, "when Samuel Emlin, one of the noblest of Germantown's friends, through the Germantown *Chronicle*, asked for a gathering of all citizens of the borough who were concerned 'to provide for the poor of Germantown during the coming winter,' the new Unitarian pastor went, with a plan in his pocket of districting the Twenty-second Ward of Philadelphia (namely, Germantown) into eight divisions, and the appointment of visiting committees of citizens to each division. There

should be a central office and a paid superintendent, who should receive all applicants and notify the visitors of each case in his or her portion of the borough; there should be a board of directors, and of visitors, monthly meetings of both, and constant communication. No relief in money or material should be given except in emergencies; but for every one, worthy and unworthy, there should be the help of active friendliness.

No one else came with a plan, but only with vague notions of what could be done. It needed but the presentation of the definite scheme of action to insure Samuel Emlin's hearty approval and its immediate adoption."[1] A public meeting was then called, largely attended, and the Germantown Relief Society, the first society for organizing charity of the United States was launched.[2]

The new association utilized volunteer household visitors, each of whom it assigned to cover a definite territory. It was their function to investigate and befriend all applicants for aid found within their respective territories. The association "availed itself of the soup-houses, fuel societies, churches, and especially of the out-door municipal relief in procuring the requisite assistance, and supplemented it as need indicated from its own resources."[3] The Germantown experiment emphasized volunteer service and coöperation—the coöperation being in the main between such volunteers and the families

[1] Alice Ames Winter, editor "Charles Gordon Ames: A Spiritual Autobiography," pp. 191-192 (1913).

[2] Some of the earlier reports of the Charity Organization Society of New York City refer to Rev. Charles G. Ames as "the originator of C. O. work in the country." See the Sixth Annual Report of this society, 1888, p. 99. Both Mr. Ames and his wife, Fanny B. Ames, were later active in helping to organize the charities of Springfield, Mass., and of Philadelphia. An address of Mr. Ames, "Wisdom in Charity," was printed and had a large run. Mrs. Ames while a resident of the State of Pennsylvania was the chief advocate of the removal of children from the almshouses of the state. She was also one of the founders of the Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania.

[3] William D. P. Bliss, "The New Encyclopedia of Social Reform," p. 220 (1908).

helped and their friends, since there existed at the time in Germantown almost no social agencies, except those mentioned. As the aid societies of the churches had no idea of charity except as alms-giving, which was confined in each case to the church administering it, the new association proved a big step in advance over any method previously devised in Germantown, or for that matter, in Philadelphia for handling the problem of relief.[1]

It is of interest to note that while the Germantown Relief Society was modelled after the methods of the London Society,[2] its form of organization shows distinct traces of the influence that the Elberfeld system of poor relief had exerted on the mind of its founder. This is seen most clearly in its use of the German "space" system of assigning visitors to definite territories as opposed to the "case" system of assigning tasks to volunteers which has characterized the subsequent development of the movement for organizing charity in this country.

Abortive Beginnings in New York

In the same year as the "Germantown Experiment" a Bureau of Charities was formed in New York City, of which Mr. Henry E. Pellew was chief promoter and secretary, that proposed to register persons receiving outdoor relief, either from the city, benevolent societies, or individuals. Many of the charitable institutions of the city responded favorably to the plans of the bureau, but the scheme was frustrated the next year by the refusal of others quite influential, including the largest relief-giving society in the city, to coöperate, although thousands of

[1] Philadelphia did not establish its Society for Organizing Charity until 1878. This was after societies had been launched in Buffalo and New Haven, and substantial progress had been made toward the creation of such a society in Boston.

[2] Charles E. Cadwalader, "Organization of Charities in Cities," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 8th session, pp. 100 and 101 (1881).

persons were known to be living at the time in the city as impostors, "by misdirected charity largely." [1]

Beginnings in Boston

The next development of the movement occurred in Boston, where the fire of 1872 and the crisis of 1873, with its subsequent years of depression, had called forth a fund of charitable spirit. Dr. Charles P. Putnam with others founded in 1873 the Boston Society for the Relief of Destitute Mothers and Infants, which was a pioneer in establishing the policy of keeping mother and child together. In the autumn of 1875 the Coöperative Society of Volunteer Visitors among the Poor was formed on a plan, a modification of the Elberfeld system as proposed by Octavia Hill for London after she had studied the plan of von der Heydt.[2] No visitor was to have more than four families at a time. Lists of families were obtained from a physician from among the families he met in his capacity of volunteer almoner for the Boston Provident Association. The society operated in the "North End" of Boston only. Later a similar society was founded in East Boston.[3] As time went on, the need of such a society and its extension all over the city was more and more plainly seen. This growing realization of the need of unifying the charitable work of Boston paved the way for the organization of an Associated Charities that would embrace the city.

[1] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 149 (1903).

[2] Miss Zilpha D. Smith stated in person to the author that in 1875 descriptions of the Elberfeld system had reached Boston and also some of the papers by Miss Octavia Hill, of London. Miss Hill urged the organization of a group of volunteer visitors with an honorary secretary to act in coöperation with private relief agencies. Miss Smith says owing to the inspiration from these two sources, but chiefly from Miss Hill's own words and work, Boston began to organize friendly visiting.

[3] It was later merged in the East Boston Conference of the Associated Charities.

In the spring of 1876 a group of volunteer workers decided to start a Registration Bureau in which they could enter the names of all the families being aided by charity and the amount of relief that they were receiving. Delegates from the various agencies came together to discuss the plan and, after expressing their approval, elected a committee to carry on the work. Mr. Pellew, of whose work in New York City mention has just been made, gave valued help to those interested in Boston. A small amount of money was raised, and one of the volunteers interested undertook in the fall of that year to do the work for a nominal salary. A good start was made: the coöperation of several of the largest societies and of the Overseers of the Poor was secured. In the meantime the Buffalo Charity Organization Society, which next is to claim our attention, had been launched and was perfecting its plans of organization. After a year and a half the worker in charge of the Registration Bureau was obliged to give up the work. Because of this, and in view of a larger enterprise in the nature of an Associated Charities then under discussion, the work of the Bureau was abandoned the spring of 1878.

The Buffalo Society

The first city in the United States to claim a city-wide charity organization society was Buffalo, whose society dates from 1877. The influence of the London Society was both marked and direct. Shortly before the financial crisis of 1873, there had moved to Buffalo an English clergyman, the Rev. S. H. Gurteen, who had formerly been associated with the Charity Organization Society of London. The distress incident to the crisis of '73 was apparent on all sides in Buffalo. With a view to correcting the lavish abuse of charity apt to take place under such circumstances, Mr. Gurteen had preached a

series of sermons which was afterwards published in pamphlet form under the title of "Phases of Charity." [1] These discourses had been largely attended, and ultimately had led to the reëstablishment of the Guild of his church (St. Paul's) on much better lines than had formerly existed. Under his inspiration it had become a very active force in the community. Alms and advice were freely given not only to members of St. Paul's Church and to members of the Episcopal communion, but to any one in need who proved to be "deserving" after investigation. This aid was given with no attempt at proselytization, and greatly broadened the conception of charity in Buffalo.

In the winter of 1876 Mr. Gurteen's duties in connection with this Guild had brought him into close contact with the poor of Buffalo. He soon discovered that "in spite of all that was being done in the way of so-called charity in the city of Buffalo, pauperism was steadily on the increase. The most truly deserving were those who did not seek, and, therefore, very often did not get relief. The pauper, the impostor, and the fraud of every description were carrying off at least one-half of all charity, public and private, and hence there was a constant and deplorable waste in the alms-fund of the city." [2] Not long after this, an enthusiastic little band led by Mr. Gurteen launched the Buffalo Charity Organization Society (December, 1877).[3]

[1] "Phases of Charity," lectures embracing the following subjects: Pauperism and Charity, Charity and the Individual, Charity and the Home, Charity and Society, Charity and the Church. In the second edition, there were added to the above, "The proposed constitution of the charity organization society of Buffalo adopted Dec. 11, 1877," and "suggested rules for the direction of the district committees, adopted by the council, Jan. 17, 1878. *Char. Rev.*, Vol. VIII, p. 367 (1898).

[2] S. Humphreys Gurteen, "Beginning of Charity Organization in America," *Lend-a-Hand*, Vol. XIII, p. 355 (1894).

[3] Discussing the founding of the Buffalo Society, the Rev. S. H. Gurteen writes: "The Elberfeld plan had been described in the magazines and by the press of the country, and had thus acquired celebrity, although few, if any, of those who had given attention to the subject imagined for a single moment that the Westphalian plan could be naturalized in

The new society followed the district plan of organization, dividing the city into eight districts,[1] corresponding with the police precincts. District offices were opened in residences near the center of the district "so that there should be no taint of officialism about the work, but that the poor might come to a real *home*, with home surroundings and thus be, perhaps unconsciously, bettered by the contact." [2]

Each district had its District Committee, composed exclusively of men, "for this is especially a man's work," [3] and a corps of friendly visitors, in which service every effort was bent to interest the better circumstanced, especially the women of the district. The society was pledged to administer no relief funds of its own. Its plan of treatment therefore consisted largely in bringing the "rich into such close relations with the poor as cannot fail to have a civilizing and healing influence."[4] It was maintained that such relations would "long knit all classes together in the bonds of mutual help and good will," and that "everything else" would follow.[5]

As to the number of families per visitor, the society held no hard and fast rule, but expressed itself as believing that "the most effective work is done when one, and only one, family is assigned to each visitor." [6] The society

our own country. It was accordingly determined by some of our public-spirited men to introduce in the city of Buffalo the plan which had proved to be so effective in the great English metropolis; such minor changes being made as would adapt it to the institutions and habits of thought of our own people." S. H. Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," pp. 58, 59 (1882).

[1] To save expense some of the districts were combined so that instead of eight there were but practically four. *Ibid.*, p. 127.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 127. In this one sees the settlement idea. The fact that Buffalo afterward abandoned the plan and that it has never been copied as far as the author knows, is doubtless due to the fact that it puts too great a strain on the agent, making his a day and night job much more taxing than settlement life because all the families with whom he deals are in distress.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 186.
In most cities men and women have worked together.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 180.

was never able to reach this standard, but where it was tried the secretary wrote that whereas visitors had formerly become thoroughly tired of constant visiting, with little, if any beneficial results, under the "one family" system, the work became "a fascination" and the duty rendered "a positive pleasure." [1]

A striking aspect of launching the new society was the spirit of coöperation and good will that existed on all sides. One reason for this may have been the absence in Buffalo of any general relief society such as had been founded in many of the principal cities of America during the A. I. C. P. movement of the forties. Perhaps a more complete explanation lies in the fact that those launching the new society let it be distinctly understood that the scheme which they advocated was simply an *organization* of existing local charities, that it did not aim at destroying their individualities or abridging in any way their operations, that each would retain its autonomy intact, while its usefulness would be enhanced by coöperation with other institutions.[2]

Coöperation was further gained by two other principles of the new organization. First it was laid down as fundamental that the society should recognize in its operations all forms of religious belief, all political affiliations and all nationalities. All cases were to be treated impartially. The greater liberality of religious thought then beginning to obtain made it natural that the charity organization movement should from the outset emphasize its non-sectarian character and affirmatively repudiate any attempt at proselytism.[3] Secondly, the society made

[1] S. H. Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity," p. 180. Miss Zilpha D. Smith after years of experience with friendly visitors stated to the author that the one family plan does not yield the best results since it is not sufficiently educational to the visitor.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 49, 50.

[3] To guard against any possible tendency toward sectarianism, no clergyman was elected to the Council of the new society. "The control of the Society should never be in the hands of the clergy. The Society affords ample opportunities for clerical coöperation apart from the direc-

it a fundamental principle never to give relief in any shape whatsoever, unless in very exceptional cases. After the society had investigated a case it referred it for relief to any benevolent association, religious or secular, or to an individual citizen according to the nature of the problem. The society, "as a Society, i.e., in the persons of its Council, District Committees, Agents and Volunteer Visitors in each and every part of its work, was to ignore all questions of this nature." [1] To do otherwise it was felt "would inevitably bring the Society's career to a speedy and ignominious ending." [2] It, unlike other pioneer societies, took the position that it had nothing to do with the administration of relief, but that its functions were simply offering "its services for investigation." [3]

As the formation of the new organization had been furthered by a number of public-spirited citizens [4] who had become aroused to the necessity of reforming the methods of administering the municipal relief of Buffalo, it is not surprising that the new society early entered upon a crusade for the reduction of public outdoor relief. The society maintained that municipal relief should be given in institutions only,[5] and that outdoor relief, or relief to the poor in their homes, should be left to private charity. This was partly because indoor or institutional relief was felt to be less open to fraudulent use, and partly because

tion of its affairs." Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," p. 123 (1882).

[1] Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," p. 121 (1882).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 122.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

[4] While S. H. Gurteen may justly be called the founder of the Buffalo Charity Organization Society since he furnished the idea and inspiration, the credit of putting the society on a practical working basis belongs to a small but active group of public-spirited men of whom T. Guilford Smith deserves special mention. See note by Editors of *Charities Review* appended to article on Stephen Humphreys Gurteen, by T. Guilford Smith, *Charities Review*, Vol. VIII, p. 365 (1898).

[5] Five groups only were, according to Gurteen, entitled to official indoor relief: (1) Orphans (half or whole); (2) The Aged; (3) The Insane; (4) The Incurably Sick; (5) The Crippled. S. H. Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," p. 136 (1882).

it was believed that a public relief fund had a bad psychological effect on the poor. It was felt that it created in them a feeling of a right to it which led them to fling themselves upon it without thrift.[1] In its crusade for the reduction of public outdoor relief, the new society endeavored to gain not only the coöperation of ministers, lawyers, bankers, merchants and all other influential citizens, but also of the officers of the various charitable institutions of the city and the Poor-Law officials. It secured permission to copy the books of their office and entered upon a plan of active coöperation with the Poor Department of the city government whereby it investigated all the outdoor relief given by the Poor Department and transmitted to the Overseer of the Poor its findings and recommendations. Decisions, however, did not rest on the findings of the society alone. The Overseer of the Poor and the officers of the police force were required to inquire separately into the actual wants of such persons as appeared to need assistance. It was felt that these three methods of inquiry ought to act "as checks upon each other" and "greatly lessen the risk of favoritism in the distribution of relief." That this belief was in part justified is shown by the fact that in three years' time the society was instrumental in reducing city outdoor relief from $100,636 to $28,295 per annum.[2] In four years' time it accomplished a total saving to the taxpayer in the single item of public outdoor relief of $133,500.[3] The evidence does not show that there resulted any material increase in suffering among the poor, but that "nearly one-third of the applicants for relief" [4]

[1] For a fuller discussion of the objections to public outdoor relief see A. G. Warner, "American Charities," pp. 167-175 (1894). The relation between public and private charity is discussed in the seventeenth chapter of this book.

[2] Frederic Almy, "Relief," a pamphlet published by the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, p. 25 (1910).

[3] Charles D. Kellogg, "Reports and Papers of the Charity Organization Society of New York City," No. 4 (1882).

[4] The Annual message of the Mayor of Buffalo for the year 1879, see Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," p. 62 (1882).

were not in need of it. There was thus not only achieved a marked saving to the taxpayer, but also a saving in the reduction of the demoralizing results that always accompany indiscriminate relief.

Beside its work of detecting fraud and driving beggars from the streets and its work for the so-called "honest poor," the Buffalo Society soon added two other lines of work. One was the establishment of various "well-proved schemes for the encouragement of thrift and self-help," and the other "the suppression of social abuses."[1]

Preparatory to carrying out the first of these, Mr. Gurteen made a trip to Europe in the summer of 1878 for the especial purpose of studying in detail the Provident Dispensaries, the Penny Bank system, the Model Dwellings of the Poor, the Workingmen's Clubs, the Day Nurseries of London and the famed Crèche system of France, especially of Paris. On his return to Buffalo he delivered a second course of lectures at St. Paul's Cathedral during the latter months of 1878, explanatory of the various provident schemes of London which had been put in operation either at the suggestion of the Charity Organization Society or independently, but with the full approval of its executive council.

Because there was scarcely a week that did not disclose "cases of distress arising from the fact that the mother, who is able and willing to work and has work offered, is reduced to begging simply because she has no one to take a loving care of her little ones," the new society launched a plan in the fall of 1879, which resulted the year following in the establishment of the Fitch Crèche.[2] In little more than a year it afforded "food, shelter and first steps in their secular education to over three thousand little ones," [3] the children of mothers whose circumstances had been investigated and found

[1] S. H. Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," p. 180 (1882).
[2] Named for Mr. Benjamin Fitch of New York City, who gave the house and grounds occupied by the Crèche.
[3] S. H. Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," p. 92.

to be unable to earn sufficient for their support apart from such aid.

While the Crèche was considered the most important among the provident schemes which the society set on foot, it was not without rivals. The year 1881 saw the establishment of the Provident Woodyard, which was to continue as an activity of the society for thirteen years. The Woodyard offered a "work-test," which was characterized by the head of the society as "the most perfect touchstone for discriminating between the deserving and undeserving that has ever been devised." [1]

By 1882 it seems fair to state that the Buffalo Society had gained the confidence of the community as a demonstrated success. It had been instrumental in cutting down the amount of public outdoor relief to an appreciable extent. It had aided in improving the conditions of life and work of the grain shovellers of the city. Lastly, it had accomplished an almost entire suppression of street and house-to-house begging, and had improved "the condition of the worthy poor by friendly visiting and by the employment of over one thousand applicants.[2]

The New Haven Society

New Haven, Connecticut, was next to organize its charity (May 23, 1878). The need for such a step, as elsewhere, grew out of the unprecedented extent of unemployment which obtained during the long industrial depression following the crisis of 1873. The difficulty of finding work in New Haven was so great that in May of 1878 a meeting of some 400 unemployed was held on the steps of the old State House on the Green, in order to petition the Common Council to supply them with work. Three social agencies of the city, the City Missionary

[1] S. H. Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," p. 31.
[2] Charles D. Kellogg, "Reports and Papers of C. O. S. of New York City," No. 4 (1882).

Society, the Aid Society and the United Workers conceived the idea, apparently independently and simultaneously, that some definite steps must be taken to meet the situation. These three societies thereupon joined forces with three others, and thereupon launched the Organized Charities Association, a federation of the six, which from time to time thereafter was enlarged by the inclusion of still other social agencies.[1] More important, however, was the fact that soon after its organization the activities of the association went far beyond its original purpose of meeting an emergency problem of unemployment. It soon took on the routine functions of a charity organization society and so becomes a part of the story of the early days of the organization of charity in this country.[2]

The Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity

In the city of Philadelphia in 1878 there existed no less than 270 voluntary organizations for the aid of the suffering and needy, besides 547 religious congregations, each of which recognized some obligation to care for the poor.[3] The amount of money raised by these various benevolent societies and churches was estimated at $1,546,049.98. Scores of societies had "little knowledge of each other's work and liable at any time to see new competitors for public patronage spring up about them, anxious each about its income, duplicating machinery to work at cross purposes, most of them too local, sectarian or obscure to command the confidence and support of all the community.[4] On the 18th of February, 1878, a cir-

[1] In 1881 the Hebrew Benevolent Society and the office of the town agent which handled the public outdoor relief were included. In 1884 the Protestant Industrial Association and the Grand Army of the Republic were added. By 1903 the federation claimed a membership of thirteen regular societies.

[2] Francis Wayland was one of the organizers and for twenty-five years president of the association.

[3] D. O. Kellogg, "On Organization of Charity in Philadelphia," *The Penn Monthly*, Vol. IX, p. 709 (1878).

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 716.

cular appeared, signed by twenty-six citizens, many of whom were identified with the soup societies of Philadelphia, asking for a conference of citizens the first of March "to discuss, and, if possible, determine on a method by which idleness and beggary, now so encouraged, may be suppressed, and worthy, self-respecting poverty be discovered and relieved at the smallest cost to the benevolent." [1] A general meeting of managers and trustees of charitable enterprises of the city was called for March 1st, at which time a committee embracing representatives of all the leading charities of the city was appointed to consider and report on the whole subject.[2]

The committee's report was laid before a general meeting of citizens in June of the same year. One of the reasons given why a radical reform in the general administration of all relief agencies was needed was the inefficiency and corruption which pervaded the city outdoor relief as distributed by the official visitors of the guardians of the poor.

The committee recommended the establishment of a central agency through which all the public and private charities of the city might work for mutual protection, economy and efficiency. The new agency was to help not to hinder or supplant. It was not to administer all the charity of Philadelphia but to help systematize the charity given according to a knowledge of the needs of each

[1] First Annual Report of the Central Board to the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicancy, p. 6 (Oct. 1, 1879).

[2] The committee included Joshua L. Baily, Rudolph Blankenburg, Philip C. Garrett, Thomas S. Harrison, Wm. W. Justice, Chas. Spencer and James A. Wright. Philip C. Garrett was chairman of the well-known Committee of One Hundred interested in good government and the redemption of the city from the control of James M. Manes and the "Gas Trust Ring." Rudolph Blankenburg, also a member of the Committee of One Hundred, was later mayor of the city.

It is interesting to note that the founder of the Buffalo society was asked to visit Philadelphia when the new society was first thought of to advise and council with those interested in its formation. Mr. Charles G. Ames, the father of the "Germantown Experiment," was among those who were active in the formative period of the society's existence.

helped and with the aim of eventual self-support ever in mind. A constitution and a provisional organization was set on foot. Thus came into existence the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicancy, which name was later shortened to the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity.

In addition to following the London form of title, the new society followed very closely the decentralized plan of organization of the London society.[1] A separate association was formed in almost every ward of the city, and it was planned that the society as a whole should be managed by delegates from these ward associations. Each ward association was to have an independent treasury supported by residents of the ward, who were also expected to give their personal service in the relief and cure of distress. The new society was dominated by the idea of reproducing in each of the thirty wards of the city a complete association like that existing in Germantown. The form of organization was the extreme of local self-government. It was based on the belief that the best way to get families out of their troubles was first to devise a wise plan and then, have the charitable forces of each neighborhood pull together in carrying out the plan in order that the work could be done at close range. That Philadelphia should have followed the London plan of organization rather than the Buffalo one where the work was centralized, though carried out through district offices, was due in large measure to the fact that Philadelphia preserved to a greater extent than most other large American cities of the time, a feeling of local responsibility in the several one-time independent communities that made up the city. In the seventies many wards of the city were true social

[1] This is still the London plan. It has been abandoned everywhere in the United States. Philadelphia began to change its plan in 1901. In London the various methods of helpfulness of the central council to the various committees and the strong work that the council has always done have helped to solidify that form of organization and to unify the work of the society.

units, with the rich and poor of the neighborhood in visible relationship. In three and a half years the city was entirely covered by the district branches of the society. The system of district committees with local self-government, even in the collection and disbursement of funds, soon became known throughout C. O. S. circles as the "Philadelphia plan." [1]

The Philadelphia society followed the London society in still another matter, in that it was a relief-giving as well as a relief-obtaining society.[2] There was, however, on the part of many of the local leaders in the movement a strong opposition to the society holding a relief fund of its own. Part of the opposition seems to have been due to the jealousies which unhappily existed in the management of many of the old relieving agencies of the city.

The new society also encountered the jealousy of "the political dispensers of the official relief from the city treasury, who resented interference with so profitable an instrument of political patronage; and professional politicians began to devise means to strangle the reform at its birth. To crush the pretensions of the new society that, by a better adjustment and coördination of all public and private charity, the claims and needs of the dependent classes could be more adequately and economically met, it leaked out that it was in the following year (1879) determined by its enemies to suspend the twelve paid visitors, who were the dispensers of the $50,000 to $75,000 previously annually appropriated to the overseers of the poor for outdoor relief, and to take the newborn enterprise at its word, and to throw upon it the whole burden of relieving those who for years had applied to the city for coal, groceries, etc., and had received doles from the visitors. The new society got to work in November, 1878, and the following year the city's winter budget cut off all customary provision for the city out-

[1] For reasons why the Philadelphia plan failed see pp. 283, 284.

[2] To-day the London and Philadelphia societies, though having relief funds, do a very large part of their work on the special case system.

door relief, and citizens were requested to refer all applicants for relief, not otherwise provided for, to the new society, which bravely undertook the burden. It was urged that such a change would increase the suffering among the poor, would swamp the voluntary relief societies, and, by filling the almshouse to overflowing, would increase the expenses of the indoor departments of the guardians of the poor far beyond the amount which would be saved by abolishing the outdoor relief."[1] Far different results followed. There was no great increase in the demands made for relief on the private societies and the population of the almshouse actually decreased.[2] Whether the reason for abolishing outdoor relief in Philadelphia was that of economy or some other, certain it is that the change was made at the direct request of the society, and as the result of sentiment against outdoor relief created by direct agitation. Philadelphia thus became the first large city in America to abolish public outdoor relief.

In November of 1879 the Philadelphia society began the publication of a *Monthly Register* which contained news of the work not only in Philadelphia, but also elsewhere. The *Register,* published for twenty years, thus became the pioneer of a series of journals launched later in New York and Chicago in the interest of social and civic work culminating in *The Survey.*

At the same time the society made provision in its by-laws for an organization known as the "Assembly," which was to include within its membership, in addition to its own members, many of the official boards of the city and county of Philadelphia, such as the Board of Health and Inspectors of the County Prison, etc., and representatives of such societies as should be admitted to

[1] E. T. Devine, "Public Outdoor Relief," *Charities Review,* Vol. VIII, pp. 190-191 (1898).

[2] Ella F. Harris, "Charity Functions of the Pennsylvania County," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. XLVII, p. 169 (1913).

coöperation. It thus became a permanent "committee of the whole." The work of the Assembly was carried on by means of the following ten committees usually of fifteen persons each.

1. Visitation and Women's Work.
2. Employment.
3. Means of Promoting Provident Habits.
4. Medical Charities.
5. Education and Care of Dependent Children.
6. Care of Defective Classes.
7. Hygiene, Sanitary Measures, etc.
8. Penal and Reformatory Institutions.
9. Legal Protection of the Poor.
10. Pauperism and Vagrancy and their Causes.

The monthly meeting of the Assembly, which convened for a number of years, served as an open forum for the discussion of charitable and community problems and exercised a wide influence on the social spirit of the city. Inside views of work of various agencies of the city were given with mutual benefit. Committees were appointed to make special studies of important subjects, some of which resulted in practical reforms. Much stimulus to efforts to improve child welfare work is traceable to these meetings. The Assembly was in short a forerunner of the Central Council of Social Agencies which began to develop throughout the country beginning in 1908. In 1881 the Public Education Association [1] of Philadelphia was established as an outgrowth of the society's work. The need of more adequate provision for wise and human dealing with deserted children, enforced by the reports which came in from many of the ward associations, led to the organization the year following of the Children's Aid Society and Bureau of Information, to which the society gave a room in connection with the central office. Within six months' time about 180 children, destitute or

[1] Now Public Education and Child Labor Association.

abandoned or worse, were placed in selected homes, mostly in the country. The new society thus became a great aid to the work of its ward and district associations in their handling of broken families.

While the yearly saving to the taxpayers of from $50,000 to $75,000 formerly spent on outdoor relief had been an important achievement, it was by no means the only thing by which the new organization was gaining in these early years the confidence of the community. At the end of its third year the society had upon its records "over 1,100 families of not less than 4,000 persons, who, having been chronic paupers, with all the debasement the name implies, had been, by the friendly ministrations of its men and women, raised into conditions of self-respect and self-support."[1] The city was reported at the time as comparatively free from street begging, and the blind application of charity had been greatly reduced. By the close of the period under review the society claimed "a strong central organization aiding the local associations and maintaining uniformity and discipline throughout the whole."[2] The city was probably more thoroughly districted than any other at the time. Its local associations were headed by committees employing paid superintendents, who were assisted by volunteer friendly visitors. Moreover, the society had been able to influence improvements in the administration of the city charitable and correctional institutions, and the community had been aroused to studying methods of charity to an extent before unknown.

The Brooklyn Bureau of Charities

The next place to organize its charity was Brooklyn, New York. Mr. Seth Low, a public spirited citizen of

[1] Charles D. Kellogg, "Reports and Papers," C. O. S. of N. Y. C., June, 1882, No. 4.

[2] Dr. J. W. Walk, "Report of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 10th session, p. 124 (1883).

Brooklyn,[1] had by chance been present at the inauguration of the Buffalo society. The conditions in Brooklyn were so similar to those that had called the Buffalo society into existence that, in the latter part of the year following (1878), Mr. Low invited to his home a few gentlemen who with him took the initial steps which soon afterwards resulted in the formation of the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities. Prominent among the organizers besides Mr. Low was Mr. Alfred T. White.[2] They had as staunch supporters of the enterprise many who had served as volunteer visitors for the public outdoor relief of the city.

Small public doles to the poor which had begun in Brooklyn without warrant of law about 1850 had grown by 1870 into a system under which nearly one-tenth of the population of Brooklyn received each winter weekly rations from public storehouses in different parts of the city. A more demoralizing system cannot be easily imagined. "At the distributing offices on relief days," writes a contemporary, "hundreds of women could be seen waiting possibly half a day to receive their weekly doles. The amount thus distributed averaged about $130,000 in value each winter, a sum fully three times the total of the annual relief supplied by private almsgiving societies. During this time all forms of private charity were hampered and dwarfed. The press of the city united to condemn the system, but its entrenchments were strong. It was the very magnitude of the evils resulting from the

[1] Mr. Low afterward became President of Columbia University and Mayor of New York City.

[2] Mr. White had already been interested in providing model tenements for working people. He had made private investments in this line. He succeeded so well that he induced other members of his own family to coöperate in the work. The result was one of the most satisfactory demonstrations that had been made in this country of the financial success which may attend this form of philanthropy. See *Lend-a-Hand*, Vol. XVI, p. 128 (1896). These first model tenements of Brooklyn gave impulse to the great tenement house reform movement of 1879. The first tenement regulation ever made in the State of New York was made for the city of Brooklyn.

system which finally wrought its overthrow." [1] Realizing its demoralizing effects several hundred men and women had in 1876 volunteered their services to the commissioners of charities as volunteer visitors to the outdoor poor. This sounded the doom of public outdoor relief and cleared the way for a better system of charity, for out of the Association of Volunteer Visitors the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities came as a natural growth. Not only the first president, secretary and treasurer of the bureau had been volunteer visitors to the outdoor poor of the county, but most of the original trustees and members of the society had obtained their education in that school of practical service. The new society began active work in January, 1879, with Mr. Low as its first president. It had been discovered in the meantime that the city's appropriation for outdoor relief was illegal under the city charter. This resulted in its abolition but a short time after the new society began active work. Although this cut off abruptly $141,137 of doles from public funds, the number in the almshouse decreased from 10,231 to 8,736, and there was no increased demand on private charity.

The title "Bureau of Charities" was chosen because it was to be "a clearing house" of information only. During the first two years of its existence the Bureau devoted itself mainly to obtaining a registry of names from other charitable institutions, churches and individuals, aiding such contributors in turn by making the information received from one available for the benefit of all. At the end of this time it found that the work could not be maintained on so negative a line of action. To prevent individuals and other societies from being imposed upon was not enough to justify the existence of the Bureau. The Bureau, without changing its name, accordingly adopted at the beginning of 1882 the broader purposes

[1] Alfred T. White, "The Story of Twenty-five Years," *Charities*, Vol. XII, p. 7 (1904).

and policies which characterized charity organization societies elsewhere. Under Mr. George B. Buzelle, the first general secretary,[1] many district conferences of the Bureau were organized in different parts of the city, each with its corps of friendly visitors. During the first three years of its existence the society made no appeal to the public to meet its expenses; these were borne by the officers and a few of their friends. They desired that the organization should prove its right to the support of the public before making an appeal. When the society did make its appeal it met "a generous response." [2]

The Movement Spreads to Smaller Cities

The movement thus far, with the possible exception of the Germantown experiment, had been limited to the larger cities. The year 1878 saw its extension to two smaller centers of population, Syracuse, New York, and Newport, Rhode Island. In the former place a Bureau of Labor and Charities was organized December 20, 1878, with a constitution and general plan of work similar to other charity organization societies. By 1882 it had been instrumental, as similar societies had been elsewhere, in materially reducing the amount of local public outdoor relief.

In Newport a study of the situation revealed the astonishing fact that "one in ten of the population was either wholly or in part supported by charity, and that nearly one-half of that charity was thrown away." [3] The new society, formally launched February 12, 1879, announced at the outset that its object was "the per-

[1] To this service he gave his whole heart, time and strength, from November, 1881, until his death in April, 1893. During his term the Society developed from small beginnings into an active organization covering all of Brooklyn.

[2] Report of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary Meeting of the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, p. 1 (1903).

[3] Quoted by Charles D. Kellogg in his history, "Charity Organization in the United States." Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 20th session, p. 58 (1893).

manent elevation of the character and condition of the poor." As elsewhere, its first rule was to help the poor to help themselves, and the method which the society heartily adopted to accomplish this end was that of friendly visiting. By 1879 no less than fifty-two visitors were on its lists. Discovering that many of the poor who applied to them for relief during the winter had exactly the same income as others who lived comfortably throughout the year through better management, the society secured in 1880 the services of four women who volunteered to call every week from house to house to collect the small sums that these people could afford to lay by.[1] The work of inculcating habits of thrift among its beneficiaries early became a marked feature of the society in question. To the Newport society belongs the credit of inaugurating the earliest organized effort in this country on the part of a charity organization society to promote small savings among the poor.

The Boston Associated Charities

The Boston Associated Charities was founded in 1879. Mention has been made of the steps already taken in Boston, beginning in 1874, that paved the way for the establishment in 1879 of an organization for the relief of distress whose scope would embrace the entire city. It should not be forgotten in acknowledging this debt to the immediate forerunners of the Associated Charities that the ground in Boston had already been ploughed and made ready by the writings of Joseph Tuckerman, collected and edited in 1874 by Edward Everett Hale under the title "The Elevation of the Poor,"[2] and by the Boston Provident Association. As early as 1859

[1] Mrs. John H. Scribner, "The Savings Society," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 14th session, p. 143 (1887).

[2] Miss Zilpha D. Smith stated in person to the writer that the writings of Tuckerman "had great influence" in the formative days of the new movement.

the report of this society had contained a plea for the erection of a building in which the offices of the various civic charities and the principal voluntary societies of the city might bring their administrations under one roof in order to secure the advantages of close coöperation. By 1869 such a building had been erected by the joint liberality of the city and of public spirited citizens. The experience gained in the building and the habits of thought engendered by it were no small factor in advancing the cause of the Associated Charities of Boston. The formation of the new association was nevertheless bitterly opposed. Those favoring it had to fight their way to the favor of the existing charitable organizations of the city inch by inch. These older societies knew the worth of registration but doubted the value of "friendly visiting." They were willing to support the new movement, provided "the visitors had no power of relief." This condition was acceded to, and on February 26, 1879, a provisional committee was formed by delegates from many charities, which carried on the work until December 8th, when a constitution was adopted and went into effect. The Boston society thus began as a delegate body. This explains not only why the new organization was named an "Associated Charities" rather than a "Charity Organization Society," but also much of its subsequent history.

In the winter of 1878-79, district conferences with executive committees were formed tentatively in various parts of the city, and enlisted volunteers to visit the poor. Within a year, the organized districts nearly covered the city; and in December, 1881, when a charter was secured from the state, the conferences included the whole municipality, except West Roxbury and Brighton.

The new society adopted as its program the raising of the needy above the need of relief whenever possible, the obtaining of suitable aid for those incapable of earning support, the prevention of begging, the

diminution of pauperism and the prevention of children growing up as paupers by encouraging habits of thrift and self-dependence. It proposed accomplishing these objects by providing a means for the registration of all the charitable relief of Boston granted from whatever source, by the investigation of the case of each of its applicants for relief, by working in close coöperation with the public authorities, churches, charitable agencies and benevolent individuals of the city, and by the organization in each district of a large corps of volunteer visitors, so that only a small number of families should be assigned to each.

The Associated Charities was in no way to interfere with the work of churches or special societies. It proposed rather to place trustworthy information within the reach of everybody to whom the poor apply,—information which would enable people to give to those who need it, and save them from wasting, or worse than wasting, their gifts,—and to provide for volunteer visiting under the direction of organized committees.

To serve as a clearing house of information the society collected reports of all relief, and other information, by daily, weekly, or monthly returns, and posted them upon cards kept in alphabetical order. The returns of each society or persons were put on a separate card; and all the cards relating to one family were fastened together. The office would then mail to any society or person who reported relief, or who was asked to give relief to any case, a prompt reply stating what other relief was being given and by whom, in order that each person or agency relieving might have exact knowledge of the fact to the end that relief might be more intelligent. The prompt reporting back to the agency or individual interested was at the time peculiar to the Boston society. It was so successful that within two years of the founding of the new society it had become a clearing house of "all relief

given by all agencies and persons and of all information collected by them."[1]

Three features characterized the new society from its birth. First, like the Buffalo organization, it maintained no relief fund. Second, it aimed to deal largely with distress by means of personal influence. It has always striven to secure enough friendly visitors to make it possible to assign to each visitor only a few cases at a time. Each visitor acts under the guidance of a conference, and is responsible for using every endeavor to prevent the family committed to his or her charge "from sinking into pauperism." As a result of the experience of its first year of work, its president emphasized with much confidence the fact or "great discovery" that "a gentleman or lady will in a surprising proportion of cases, discover means to help a family into independence, if he or she goes into their homes and learns the whole truth, what the various members of the family can do or can be made to do; going there not only to give alms, but prohibited from doing so, and therefore forced to study how to aid the family toward self-support."[2]

Third, the Boston society aimed to use its influence to launch such enterprises for the development of thrift as savings funds, etc., *but never to undertake these extra activities itself,* though often having among the directors of such agencies many of the same persons as were interested in one capacity or another in the Associated Charities.

To an unusual degree, Boston was ready for the new movement. The coöperation of many of the leading agencies, churches and individuals [3] was early secured. It

[1] A letter from the Associated Charities of Boston, *The Monthly Register,* Vol. II, No. 8, pp. 7, 8 (1881).

[2] Robert Treat Paine, Jr., "The Work of Volunteer Visitors of the Associated Charities among the Poor," *Journal of American Social Science Association,* No. XII, Part 1, p. 110 (1880).

[3] Of these special mention should be made of Mrs. James T. Fields, one of the founders of the Boston Coöperative Society which, as has been noted, preceded the Associated Charities. Her personality was an

was not long before the Associated Charities was able to report that while it had no relief funds of its own and wanted none, coöperation with the Provident Association of the city, the Overseers of the Poor and other relief agencies was so cordial that the cases where relief was necessary were supplied by these agencies at their request and rarely were they refused. The society attributed its success in this aspect of its work to "having started with the idea of drawing" the various charitable societies "toward each other and of aiding them to organize their work rather than with the idea of organizing them from the outside,—as 'Associated Charities' rather than a Charity Organization."[1] Moreover, the society could claim at this time a confidential exchange of information regarded as unequalled elsewhere in the world,[2] and numbered its friendly visitors by the hundreds (600 to 700), gaining the reputation for Boston in charity organization circles which has ever remained with her, of being "the friendly visitors' native heath." By 1882, street and door-to-door begging were but little known. In the same year the Associated Charities appointed its first standing Committee on Dwellings of the Poor and launched thereby its long crusade for better homes.

inspiration to many. She exerted at the time a wide influence especially through her writings. Special mention should also be made to Robert Treat Paine, Jr., first president, and one whose services to the society extended over a period of years, and Dr. Charles P. Putnam, a leader who made few speeches and wrote little but who was most efficient in organizing the work. As a member of the first general committee to consider and forward plans, as chairman of the committee on district conferences, and as president of one district, Dr. Putnam's quick discernment of the special powers of individual workers, paid or volunteer, his grasp of details and of their influence on outcome, made him invaluable to the society. He was chosen president on the resignation of Mr. Paine, and was president of the Associated Charities until his (Dr. Putnam's) death in the spring of 1914.

[1] Report of Standing Committee on the Organization of Charities in Small Cities, "The Associated Charities of Boston," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 10th session, pp. 88, 89 (1883).

[2] By 1881 the society had registered over 8200 cases.

The Indianapolis Society

Indianapolis was next to join the movement. By 1878 the relief situation in Indianapolis had become critical. The city had been a city of the middle classes, of many small and modest homes, with comparatively little grinding poverty; but with its development as a railroad center and the increase of manufacturing, in spite of otherwise favorable conditions poverty and pauperism had grown rapidly. For some years there had been an enormous amount of outdoor relief recklessly distributed, although for a year or two something like business methods had been applied to its distribution and the amount considerably reduced. The Indianapolis Benevolent Society, the relief society of the city, officered entirely by volunteers and adapted more nearly to the needs of a village community than a city, had been losing more and more of a grip of the situation. The society, however, had a strong hold on the sympathy of the citizens, and those outside its management did not realize how obsolete its methods were. This was appreciated, however, by the directors, who, at the annual public meeting of the society on Thanksgiving Day, 1878, only seven persons being present, presented a proposition to disband and turn over the few dollars which remained in the treasury to some other charity.[1] One of these seven was the Rev. Oscar C. McCulloch,[2] who as a city minister had often found himself

[1] Alexander Johnson, "Oscar Carlton McCulloch," *The Charities Review*, Vol. I, p. 101 (1892).

[2] Dr. McCulloch was a combination of an idealist and a business man, and one who won men and women to him not only in the city where he was so long a leading clergyman, but in the National Conference of Charities and Correction and elsewhere. He was, subsequent to the founding of the Indianapolis Society, instrumental in organizing the State Board of Charities of Indiana, which has always commanded the services of able workers. He will long be remembered as the author of "The Tribe of Ishmael," a study in social degradation which he published in 1888 (see pp. 236, 237). For tributes to his work see In

embarrassed by the number and doubtful nature of the demands to which his sympathies impelled him to respond liberally. He had seen that charity in a large city is a very different thing from the simple neighborly helpfulness of a small town. The need of organization had thus been forced upon him; he had become convinced that without it the most careful and conscientious giver is probably doing more harm than good with his gifts.[1] This had led him to a study of sound principles of relief, so that when he described to a little group of his six fellow directors of the Benevolent Society, the work being done in Boston, Buffalo and other places, and depicted the possible future of wise charity in glowing terms, the motion to disband was dropped and a new motion to continue and develop the work prevailed, and he was elected president of the society.

It was soon thereafter that he was instrumental in founding the Indianapolis Charity Organization Society (1879), which was to bring order out of chaos. Its functions were similar to those common to other like organizations. A marked feature of the new society, however, was its centralization. The rooms of the society became the headquarters of various charitable agencies. The district committees had their offices in the same building. Telephonic connection was arranged with all public institutions. Every case of need, accident or begging was reported to the central office, and was referred to the district superintendent to whom it belonged.[2]

Memoriam, Tributes to Oscar McCulloch, Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 19th session (1892).

[1] "Twenty-five years ago (1881) the city streets in Indianapolis were full of children begging. Their mothers at home were washing their eyes with some kind of a chemical that would make them appear blind, so that people seeing their affliction would more readily give them money of which they were unworthy. To-day a begging child is seldom if ever seen in the city." *Charities and The Commons,* Vol. XVII, p. 571 (1906).

[2] W. G. Fairbanks, "Reports from States: Vermont," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 12th session, p. 85 (1885).

Beginnings in Detroit

The year 1879 saw a beginning in the organization of charity in Detroit. The history of this first effort destined to failure is illustrative of the obstacles which in more than one place confronted the new movement. By the courage and persevering efforts of a public spirited woman [1] a reform of seemingly chronic abuses of poor relief was finally inaugurated. The mayor called a public meeting at which the subject of the relief of the poor was thoroughly discussed. The plan and work of an associated charities was explained. As an outcome, the Detroit Associated Charities was finally organized in the fall, the London and Buffalo organizations serving as models for the working machinery.

The city was mapped into districts and committees and visitors were appointed for each. The new society enjoyed the assurance of substantial financial support. At first the city director of the poor was favorably inclined toward the work of the new organization. He soon, however, apparently suffered a change of heart, and it was suddenly announced in mid-winter that the city poor fund had been exhausted. In the acute situation that this evoked the Associated Charities promptly organized a relief society under its auspices.[2] When the public appropriation for the poor of the city was up for passage the Associated Charities was instrumental in having it reduced to $13,000. It soon became evident to the backers of the new organization that their work must suffer greatly so long as the city administration of relief was in politics. Accordingly the members of the organization disbanded and renewed their activities at the state capital, where they were successful in securing a law providing for

[1] Mrs. Isabel G. D. Stewart.

[2] Its officers and functions were kept distinct. It was able to disband in the spring. Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 10th session, p. 111 (1883).

a non-partisan Board of Poor Commissioners to serve without pay in place of the Director of the Poor. Early in 1880 the Associated Charities was reorganized and reëstablished with nine districts.[1] The reorganized society soon gained the appreciation of the public, and was not "wanting in substantial and liberal support."[2]

The Cincinnati Society

Cincinnati also began organizing its charity in 1879. The initiative came from several philanthropic organizations, notably the Women's Christian Association, who interested in the needs of their city had watched with interest the growth elsewhere of the movement for organizing charity. The new society began avowedly on the lines laid down in Boston, but, as it practically worked out, soon found itself on the "Philadelphia plan" of decentralization with twelve district organizations, each dispensing relief. These the Central Board was not able to control. The situation was further complicated by the fact that the voluntary relief societies of the city were inadequate to their task as were the municipal poor taxes. It was only through the careful leadership of the general secretary of the Associated Charities that a general registration was instituted, and the system of district organizations given some cohesion.[3] During the eighties, however, charity organization in Cincinnati was destined to a checkered career.[4]

[1] These nine districts were grouped into the three divisions of East, Central and West. Each division had a district office for winter service and a salaried district agent. Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, 1883, p. 111. Many volunteers were attached to these district committees, but as in Philadelphia and Cincinnati many of them failed to connect themselves with the central organization.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Charles D. Kellogg, "Charity Organization in the United States," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 12th session, pp. 52-93 (1893).

[4] "Notable is the history of Cincinnati . . . which in coquetting with relief distribution from its own treasury . . . came near the verge of

Further Extensions to Smaller Cities

The spread of the movement to smaller cities and towns had already begun. In 1879 there was a still further extension, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and Orange, N. J., making beginnings in charity organization. In the latter place a few public spirited women, having learned of the new movement in charity already begun in Buffalo, New Haven, Philadelphia and Boston, met together to take steps toward a local organization. Correspondence with the president of the Boston Associated Charities, Mr. Robert Treat Paine, Jr., and the reports of other societies, notably Philadelphia, threw much light on their problem, enabling them to crystalize their charitable theories and aspirations into an organization which they named the Orange Bureau of Registration changed in 1883 to the Orange Bureau of Associated Charities.

Beside the customary work of a charity organization society, the Orange Bureau organized as early as 1880 a union employment society. In 1882, a day nursery was opened in which children were cared for while their parents were at work, and from which, in the course of time, was evolved a primary school for those among the children left at the nursery who were old enough to receive instruction. In the same year the Bureau opened a laundry in connection with its employment society. The Orange Bureau of Charities became, along with the Brooklyn and Indianapolis societies, a pioneer in de-

extinction." Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, p. 64 (1893).

Mr. Alexander Johnson related to the author an incident illustrative of both the checkered career of the work in Cincinnati and of the danger of subsidies. One of the district societies received from the city for relief purposes after a flood in the early eighties more than it had any legitimate use for at the time. As a result the society grew lazy and during the next winter completely "flattened out," because it had been pauperized.

veloping industrial features as a part of its work of family rehabilitation.

Beginnings in charity organization were made in 1881 in three Massachusetts towns—Taunton, Lowell and Cambridge; in Salem, N. J., in Cleveland, Baltimore, and Washington, D. C. Further reference to the last two only need claim our attention here.

The Baltimore Society

After hearing an address by the president of the Boston Associated Charities on the organization of charity, Daniel C. Gilman,[1] president of Johns Hopkins University, called a meeting in Baltimore which resulted in the organization of the Charity Organization Society of Baltimore. Launched in 1881, the new organization had the advantage of the experience of similar organizations in a number of the larger American cities whose example it followed in the main. Though south of the Mason and Dixon Line the Baltimore society, in common with other societies, stated that there was to be no exclusion from its work on account of race. Not wishing to interfere in any way with existing benevolent societies, no relief was to be given except in very urgent cases or when not available from existing agencies. The society was to be a means of coöperation and of education. The methods set forth were investigation, registration as a means of coöperation, conferences of representatives of various agencies, and the personal touch, the bringing of the comfortable into contact with the wretched, and of the strong with the depressed. Its work was to cover

[1] Several years later President Gilman introduced Amos G. Warner, who was a fellow in the university to his career as social worker by nominating him for the position of general secretary of the Baltimore society. In 1892 Mr. Gilman organized the charity organization section of the International Congress of Charities and Correction held in Chicago.

the city. Not least significant, the causes of destitution and pauperism were to be studied.

For several years the society accomplished not a little by educating public opinion through offering facilities for registration and coöperation and by holding meetings of persons who were largely absorbed in the particular ways and claims of their pet charities. The education of givers and workers in district boards, through church societies and by publications, under the vigorous lead of the late John Glenn and Dr. Amos G. Warner belong, however, to a later date.

The Washington Society

At the time of launching the Washington Associated Charities in 1881 long lines of men and women, assembled with clock-like regularity in front of the soup houses of the city, were a daily spectacle at the National Capital. The Provident Aid Society of the city, "good as its intentions . . . and merciful as its benefits" had been in many instances, had closed its doors "overwhelmed with applications and conscious of a necessity for different methods."[1] Even a Labor Exchange, organized in 1877, and which for a while had done a flourishing business, had suspended work for lack of funds. The new society divided the city into eighteen subdivisions which, following the "Philadelphia plan," raised and disbursed their own funds, with aid, however, in some cases from the central office. The work to be accomplished was great, but by 1888 soup houses and penny lunch rooms in Washington were institutions of the past, and the ground prepared for more constructive work to follow later.

[1] See First Annual Report of the Associated Charities of the District of Columbia (1882).

The New York Society

The Charity Organization Society of New York City was destined to be the most influential of those founded the last years of the period under review. The ground had been well prepared for the seeds of charity organization. As early as 1873-74 an effort already noted, had been made to establish in New York City a bureau of charities to serve as a clearing house for the relief-giving agencies of the city.[1] In 1875 all public outdoor relief had been abolished except for transportation to needy transients and to resident adult blind. In the same year the State Charities Aid Association of New York had issued as one of its publications reprints of "Homes of the London Poor," by Octavia Hill. The influence of Miss Hill proved to be as marked in the work of charity organization in New York as it was in Boston and Philadelphia. In 1878 Miss Louisa Lee Schuyler had called attention to "the importance of uniting individual and associated volunteer effort in behalf of the poor,"[2] while in October, 1881, in a special report to the State Board of Charities "in relation to outdoor relief societies in New York City," Josephine Shaw Lowell[3] had pointed out the "inevitably great waste of energy, effort and money, owing to the want of coöperation among the societies which administer the charities of New York City." As a result of this report a resolution was passed by the State Board of Charities, which

[1] See pp. 177, 178 of this study.

[2] A paper read at a conference of the State Charities Aid Association of New York, which Miss Schuyler had founded in 1872. She had brought into its original membership a large number of women in New York City and throughout the state, who had been fellow workers with her during the Civil War in the Women's Central Association of Relief, which was a board of the United States Sanitary Commission, a forerunner of the Red Cross.

[3] For an account of her life and work see W. R. Stewart, "The Philanthropic Work of Josephine Shaw Lowell," also "In Memoriam," Josephine Shaw Lowell, published by Charities Publication Committee, New York (1906).

authorized the New York City Commissioners of the State Board of Charities "to take such steps as they may deem wise to inaugurate a system of mutual help and coöperation" among the societies "engaged in teaching and relieving the poor of the city in their own homes." [1]

Accordingly the New York City members of the State Board of Charities appointed a Committee on the Organization of Charities of the City of New York.[2] After several meetings, at one of which Rev. S. H. Gurteen of Buffalo "gave an extended and interesting account of charity organization societies of Buffalo and other cities, and of his views in regard to the establishment of a similar organization in the city of New York," the committee drafted a constitution which was reported back to the New York City members of the State Board, who thereupon requested the committee to become members of the Central Council and called a meeting for organization. Soon after the meeting, which was held in February of 1882, cordial expressions of approval and offers of help were received from the State Charities Aid Association and the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor. Thus was the New York society launched

[1] Mrs. Wm. B. Rice of the State Charities Aid Association united with Mrs. Lowell in urging this action on the part of the State Board of Charities. The preamble and resolution were as follows:

"*Whereas,* There are in the City of New York a large number of independent societies engaged in teaching and relieving the poor of the city in their own homes, and

"*Whereas,* There is at present no system of coöperation by which societies can receive definite mutual information in regard to the work of each other, and

"*Whereas,* Without some such system it is impossible that much of their effort should not be wasted, and even do harm by encouraging pauperism and imposture, therefore,

Resolved, That the Commissioners of New York City are hereby appointed a committee to take such steps, as they may deem wise, to inaugurate a system of mutual help and coöperation between such societies." Reports and papers, C. O. S. N. Y. C., Feb., 1888, Following Title of Seventh Annual Report of C. O. S.

[2] The members of the committee were Dr. S. O. Vanderpoel, chairman, Alfred Roosevelt, Charles S. Fairchild, Arthur M. Dodge, J. Kennedy Tod, Dr. Stephen Smith, Josephine Shaw Lowell, R. Duncan Harris and J. R. Roosevelt, Secretary.

not as "the result of popular demand," but of the earnest, patient leadership of a few persons.[1]

Beginnings in Newark and Terre Haute

In 1882 the movement spread also to Newark, New Jersey, and Terre Haute, Indiana. In the former, little progress was made at first. In the latter place the new society, which was founded by Charles R. Henderson, had the not uncommon experience of failing to secure the hearty coöperation of the two principal relief societies of the city. As a result its work was not during its early days very effectual, being more or less limited to transient cases, begging, and finding homes for children orphaned or deserted.[2]

The Early Days in Retrospect

With so many efforts for organizing charity crystallizing into definite organizations within so short a space, it is not surprising that they should have been viewed by a contemporary as an "uprising of the people in the field of charity." [3] This stage ends by 1883, since by that time the more or less independent beginnings of the movement had ceased. At the time there were approximately twenty-five charity organization societies with about half as many affiliated societies, scattered throughout the East and Middle West.

[1] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 149 (1903).

Charles D. Kellogg, secretary of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity, was engaged as organizing secretary. His familiarity with charity organization methods, his care and patience and devotion to the necessary details of the office and his considerate and generous nature which won friends in every direction, were especially valuable assets to the Society throughout its formative period." Twenty-fifth Annual Report of The Charity Organization Society of New York City, p. 18 (1907).

[2] Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, p. 84 (1883).

[3] Robert Treat Paine, Jr. See Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, p. 119 (1880).

One should not be misled by names, but should realize that some of the early societies amounted to no more than general societies for material relief, seeming to regard the word "organization" as meaning existence merely as a society. Others took the word to mean only co-operation among a few charitable agencies, an organization of charities. It is easy to copy a name, but hard to copy a thing. That the movement had been sporadic in places is indicated by the fact that up to the time under review thirteen societies, mostly in the smaller communities, had already lapsed.[1] Nevertheless a limited number of societies were societies for organizing charity both in word and deed, and from then on the steady progress of the movement was assured, though here and there the careers of individual societies were checkered.

Among those who were entitled to the name of charity organization society variations in details of method were inevitable. The charity of a city, Miss Richmond has well pointed out, is a living, breathing thing, not to be poured like plaster into a mould imported from without, but to be developed from within. It is a living thing, and like all other living things subject to the general laws of life and development. The movement came as a natural evolution or its spread would not have been either so rapid or spontaneous. Like most Anglo-Saxon institutions, it grew without any preconceived plan. What obtains at any one moment is the result of past conditions and years of growth. As each American city had had its charitable life and history before the new movement began, it is not at all surprising that previous conditions should have had their influence. The creation of an organization like the Associated Charities of Boston presupposes such a general enlightenment of the public on the aims and methods of charity organiza-

[1] Anna L. Dawes, "The Need of Training Schools for a New Profession," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. XI, p. 94 (1893).

tion as to make possible a widespread coöperation among the leaders in charity. In Philadelphia, the basis for such an association was not only lacking, but the new society encountered in its earliest years a most determined opposition from some men influential in the leading charitable societies of the city.

Emphasis on the value of permanent friendly relations between the poor and some volunteer visitor early became a marked feature of the Boston Society. On the other hand the London Society and many societies in the United States, notably that of New York City, were organized with the view of helping people in need out of a particular situation. Their object was to do a definite piece of work—"to get people out of their trouble." The difference in emphasis was due to a difference in historic background. The Boston Society had grown in part out of the Coöperative Society of Volunteer Visitors Among the Poor, and had been founded among other things to carry on that work. It aimed therefore to make the relationship between its friendly visitors and those visited a friendly and permanent one. Again, Buffalo being a younger city than London, soon found that the success of its work required departing from its London model and so established a central council and central office from which all its work could be expanded and guided. Again, the problems to be faced in a city like New York with its enormous changing population, its immigration, and its great tenement houses, and those in a city like Philadelphia with its vast area, encompassing many more or less autonomous communities, made necessary quite different forms of organization. It was no mere chance that early caused Philadelphia to develop the system of district associations which for so long a time characterized that city.

The variations in the titles adopted by the organizers of the various societies bear in some instances historical testimony of the difference in problems to be faced. Thus

as has been seen, Philadelphia, more nearly duplicating London conditions, adopted the London form of organization in the main and the London title. The Brooklyn society was called a Bureau of Charities, since it was designed to serve at first merely as a clearing house, while Boston chose the name Associated Charities as its society began as an association of charities on the delegate plan.

Certain outstanding facts are evident to the student of this early period of the charity organization movement in America. The immediate and precipitating cause of the movement was the panic of 1873 and the following years of depression. The more remote cause sprang from what for want of a better term may be called the citizenship motive—the desire to discharge more effectively the social obligations of neighborliness incident to citizenship even in the complex and unneighborly city. Charity organization societies at first naturally sprang up in the larger centers of population, as it was there that the old social relationship between the better to do and the less fortunate more completely broke down. The relatively smaller centers, such as Germantown, Philadelphia; Orange, New Jersey; Cambridge, Massachusetts; and Newport, Rhode Island, were either suburbs of large cities or smaller cities. They were in no sense rural or even country towns or villages.

The movement in not a few places received great impetus from the discontent with the prevailing methods of handling public outdoor relief. In fact, the new society often undertook as its first task steps toward the reduction of the amount of public outdoor relief or its complete abolition. It is interesting to note in this connection that the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities owed its origin to the very persons who had labored to remove the pauperizing effects in the system of public outdoor relief then obtaining in Brooklyn, but who, believing it was a losing fight, called into being a Bureau of Charities to

help abolish all public outdoor relief. As one student of the movement points out, "the same impulse that established the new societies abolished outdoor relief in Brooklyn and Philadelphia and greatly reduced it in Buffalo and Indianapolis." [1]

Charity organization, however, probably received greater impetus, if indeed it be not its *raison d'etre,* in the existing overlapping and resultant waste of private charity. "In nearly every instance," writes another student of the movement, "the motive leading to these organizations is declared to have been discontent with the prodigality and inefficiency of public relief and the chaotic state of private charity." [2]

While the movement spread so rapidly and often apparently spontaneously in America as in England, it owed its origin not so much to the fact that people were poor as to the fact that others were charitable. By no stretch of the term could the movement be called proletarian in either origin or support. The launching of these societies was in the main, as was said of the New York society, not the result of popular demand, but of the earnest patient leadership of a few persons. Its organizers and sponsors were a handful of influential and public-spirited citizens, of whom the Church contributed a goodly share who had caught a vision of a better way of helping those in distress.

It is surprising that a movement which in its early days claimed the active service of so many who were or had been in the service of the Church, should have been viewed by some as "cold." While the new societies guarded themselves scrupulously against the charge of proselyting, throughout the writings and addresses of the leaders of the period there breathes a strong underlying religious spirit enjoining all men to succor the weak. A

[1] Amos G. Warner, "American Charities," revised edition, p. 444 (1908).

[2] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 130 (1903).

partial explanation of the charge of "coldness" may have been the emphasis too often placed by some of less vision in the movement on the economy of charity organization to the taxpayer and charitable public. The emphasis on economy as a virtue in itself caused some of the societies to be viewed as devices for "saving the taxpayer."

To a student of social institutions it is possibly not surprising that "one of the most formidable obstacles that" the new societies "had to contend against, especially in the older cities," was "the unreasonable prejudice of long-established charitable institutions and benevolent societies." [1] Charity organization came as a reform and reforms are naturally looked at askance.

Among the other outstanding features of the spread of the movement during the early days was the free trade in ideas. Individuals brought back to their own communities accounts of what was going on elsewhere. This frequently resulted in an informal interchange of information. The *Monthly Register* of the Philadelphia Society early proved a forum for the new societies. The movement found expression of its unity in the sixth National Conference of Charities and Correction, held in Chicago, when Mr. Seth Low presented a description of the work in Brooklyn and a committee was appointed upon Charity Organization. By 1881 not less than sixteen societies sent detailed reports of their work to the National Conference of Charities and Correction held that year.

The inspiration of the movement during these earlier days was clearly English, although the writings of Joseph Tuckerman, collected and edited in 1874, had a definite influence, particularly in Boston. The pioneers on this side of the water turned to the writings of Edward Denison and Octavia Hill. Repeated references to the work and writings of the latter are found especially in the reports and papers of the Boston, New York and Philadelphia societies. The motto of the Boston Associated

[1] S. H. Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," p. 121 (1882).

Charities, copied by many other societies, "Not alms, but a friend," specializing the word in its finest sense for a relation based upon love, was the direct inspiration of Octavia Hill.[1]

The point of view—the philosophy of the pioneers in both England and America, steeped as it was in the Manchester School of Economics, was philanthropic individualism. The stress was on personal influence, neighborly intercourse with the poor. The end was the building of character, and this involved the action of individual on individual—"the living touch." The big evil that the pioneers saw was pauperism, a character defect, rather than poverty, an economic and social question. Charitable people were interested in relieving those below what has been called a line of "tolerable misery." Friendly visitors were admonished to prevent families in their charge from sinking into pauperism. Reports record with satisfaction the numbers of families "rescued from lives of chronic pauperism and started on respectable and self-dependent courses." The prevention of pauperism was a leading topic at the first National Conference of Charities and Correction. It is but natural that pauperism rather than poverty should have been the main object of attack in the earlier days. With the West just being developed poverty was a relatively smaller problem than it is to-day. Moreover our knowledge of the nature and causes of poverty has advanced in the interim as have our standards of living. The emphasis of these earlier days on pauperism rendered invaluable service, especially in calling attention to the evils of much of the charity of the day, both private and public. Moreover, the fight against pauperism is ever present. The old ideas were not, are not, wrong. They have been rounded out, relieved from certain implications which are now recognized as false, and added unto.

[1] Erving Winslow, "Philanthropic Individualism," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 555 (1915).

The fear that pauperism growing rampant should endanger the social order was occasionally put forward in some quarters as a motive for supporting the new movement. "We have ourselves created the monster (Pauperism)," wrote the founder of the Buffalo society, "have ourselves infused life into it, and we shall have ourselves alone to blame if the poor, craving for human sympathy, yet feeling their moral deformity, should some fine day wreak their vengeance upon society at large." Again, it was held that charity organization societies would prove "the real answer to the Socialistic and Communistic theories" then "being energetically taught to the people." The work of dealing with the elements of character in concrete individual cases, the writer urged, would prove an antidote to "any artificial scheme of improving the condition of men without training them in elements of character." [1]

It is not at all surprising that a movement, launched in London under the chaotic charitable conditions existing in that city in 1869 and introduced into the United States at a time when public outdoor relief was in many places lavish and its administration careless, extravagant or even corrupt, and private almsgiving was too often a source of pauperism, should lay down as fundamental the principles of investigation, registration, coöperation and friendly visiting.

The purpose of investigation and registration was not merely "to find out fraud and stop excessive alms," but also to "decide wisely on the kind and quantity of relief to continue." Its essence was "to secure exact knowledge of the facts and so to add to the judgment and joy of the gift;" [2] to make benevolence, beneficence. Through its system of record keeping the charity organization society became the first social agency to apply scientific

[1] D. O. Kellogg, "Charity in Philadelphia," *The Penn Monthly,* Vol. IX, p. 719 (1878).

[2] See Letter from the Associated Charities of Boston, *The Monthly Register,* Vol. II, p. 7 (1881).

methods to human relationships. The end of coöperation is strength.[1] The motto of the New York Society, "United, an army; divided, a mob," is illustrative. Social resources to be effective must be organized and so the societies called themselves charity organization societies or, still more graphically, societies for *organizing* charity.

The importance placed by the pioneers on the "living touch" explains the emphasis of nearly all the early societies on friendly visiting. It was to bring "those of different classes into real friendly relations and so in time help raise those who are fallen low in any sense of the word." [2]

The fear of relief among the early workers was due not only to the fact that the movement was launched at a time when there were on all sides societies leaning on the crutch of a relief fund administering material aid without system and as mere doles but also to the belief that a too liberal relief policy might inhibit the undeveloped personal resources inherent in all families, and that relief in usual practice too often was a substitute for something better. "If it (a charity organization society) asks you not to relieve," wrote Oscar McCulloch "it is simply because it sees your relief is not wise. It is your own selfishness, and not your love, that prompts the gift—selfishness because you give ten cents instead of an hour of your time. It is given from indifference, because you do not ask how you may *best* help." [3] By some workers, relief, even when necessary, was viewed as an evil.[4] The

[1] "I should say the cornerstone of the whole [movement] was a thoroughly scientific coöperation of all charitable agencies, public and private charities, church and what is omitted in the printed programs, of the whole mass of the people." Robert Treat Paine, Jr., N. C. C. C. (1880), p. 119.

[2] A letter from Octavia Hill to a visitor of the Philadelphia S. O. C. See *Monthly Register*, Vol. II, p. 6 (1881).

[3] Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, Vol. XVIII, pp. 361, 362 (1891).

[4] "Personally I believe that relief is an evil—always. Even when it is necessary, I believe it is still an evil. One reason that it is an evil is because energy, independence, industry, and self-reliance are undermined by it, and since these are the qualities which make self-support and self-respect possible, to weaken or undermine them is a serious

important thing stressed by all, however, was that those helped should be helped thoroughly—adequately. Doles of money or time had no place in the principles of the pioneers.

Because relief giving had proven one of the pitfalls that had stopped the progress of the old relief societies the weight of opinion among the leaders in the charity organization movement was against making relief-giving a function of the new societies. This one pitfall at least they could avoid. Accordingly, with some notable exceptions, the early charity organization societies described themselves as "relief-obtaining" organizations rather than "relief-giving" societies, and sought to obtain the relief needed for families under their care by turning in all instances to kindred and friends, where they were found able to help, augmenting this when necessary by interesting a relief society or some benevolent individual in the particular family in question. A factor influencing many a society to adopt the no-relief-fund policy was the fear that the opposite policy would prove fatal to the new organization's efforts to secure coöperation from the older charitable societies.

These principles or methods of work became the "foundation stones" of the new movement—the essential features which distinguished it from the beginning, not because they were novel ideas, but because they were worked out for the first time consistently, and in the main adhered to with steadily increasing faith in their potency.

It is no disparagement of the pioneers of the new movement to say that to present-day workers the so-called "principles" of charity organization have a richer content accompanied by a more satisfactory technique than they had to their predecessors of fifty years ago. It is only because the principles with which the movement began were so vital that they have been capable of almost

injury to inflict on any man." Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell, "The Evils of Investigation and Relief," *Charities*, Vol. I, p. 9 (1898).

indefinite development. As one student of the movement wrote on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the New York Society: "The reason why investigation, registration, coöperation, and adequate relief are not now prominent in every discussion is not because these 'foundation pillars' have been allowed to crumble away, but because the twenty-five years have strengthened them until their names are commonplaces, and attention is naturally centered on the superstructure they support." [1]

[1] Lilian Brandt, "The Charity Organization Society of the City of New York," 1882-1907, p. 13 (1907). (The Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Society).

CHAPTER VII

EXTENSION OF THE MOVEMENT

[1883-1895]

THE years 1883-1895 were primarily those of geographical expansion. The number of societies increased from approximately twenty-five to about one hundred, scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, throughout the South [1] as well as throughout the North. The great majority of societies, however, as was to be expected, were east of the Mississippi and north of the Mason and Dixon Line.

As important as the expansion of the movement was the strengthening of the hold of charity organization in many of the communities where it had already taken root. Charity organization societies developed in many of these communities a kind of "overlordship of charity." The dominating position which they came to occupy resulted from the fact that the business community frequently turned to such organizations for protection from impostors. It was a natural step for them to add supervisory powers which were to eventuate into the work of charities endorsement.

In the larger cities of the country the local charity organization society came to be viewed as a fixed institu-

[1] The growth of the movement in the cities of Louisville, Memphis, Washington, Chattanooga, Richmond, Va., Wilmington, N. C., and Charleston, S. C., is the subject of favorable comment by Philip W. Ayres. See "Charity Organization in Southern Cities," *Charities Review*, Vol. IV, p. 259 (1895). In most of the places here listed it would be inaccurate to describe the local organization as a full-fledged charity organization society of the Boston or New York type.

tion. Buildings devoted exclusively to the housing of the private charities of the city soon were erected. Boston had had such a building since 1869, which had proven of great value in encouraging effective coöperation among the charities thus housed together. In 1891 Cleveland claimed a similar building, while in 1892 John Stewart Kennedy [1] erected in New York City a United Charities Building,[2] the value of which to the whole city, not to mention the local charity organization society, can hardly be exaggerated.

The movement was no longer "on trial" in the larger centers of population. Three ideas which had permeated the early work of charity organization—the abolition of petty doles, the prohibition of proselyting of every nature, and the treating of the poor with delicacy and holding their interests in sacred confidence—were accepted so generally as never to be questioned. A number of affiliated societies which had been content to give relief rather blindly, had frankly accepted the new gospel of the need for more accurate knowledge, more generous coöperation and the substitution of personal service for the cash allowance in kind.

By 1890 the fundamental principles of charity organization had so permeated public opinion that Congress passed an act creating the office of Superintendent of Charities for the District of Columbia, a department consciously built on charity organization methods, and subsequently placed as the first incumbent of the office Amos G. Warner, well known in the ranks of the charity organization movement. Many other victories were won. Principles and theories which formerly needed to be em-

[1] It was through the further generosity of Mr. Kennedy that The New York School of Social Work, a training school conducted by the New York Charity Organization Society, was made possible. See pp. 308-310.

[2] The plan of a charities building as carried out by Mr. Kennedy largely followed the lines of a suggestion for such a building made by Mr. Charles D. Kellogg, first Secretary of the New York Charity Organization Society, in a pamphlet generally circulated by him as early as 1886. See *The Survey*, Vol. XXXI, p. 536 (1914).

phasized and reiterated gradually became so well known and accepted that it was no longer necessary laboriously to urge them nor to argue on their behalf.

While the period was one of steady growth in the main, in more than one community, societies were established "from the momentum of the wave of 'charity organization' which was rolling across the country," [1] but before the field was ready for the new seed of scientific charity. This is strikingly illustrated by the early career of a society launched in Chicago in 1883. The long-established general relief society of the city, The Chicago Relief and Aid Society, held off from coöperating with the new society. Ten years before, it had won laurels for organizing relief in the emergency of the great fire, and it did not regard the new agency as necessary. The real value of coöperation, true organization of charitable forces and resources, was little understood in the community and the new society, overshadowed by the older society, was a few years later "benevolently assimilated" by it and so ceased to exist.[2] This is but one instance of others that might be cited of premature starts.[3]

Still other societies had checkered careers throughout the whole period, depending for their very life on a few individuals. Some societies in even so short a time had gone through three stages. The first was characterized by the adoption of material relief. In some instances the society repeated the same process of degeneration that characterized the A. I. C. P. movement during its later years,[4] when it was depending almost solely on material relief as a means of treatment. The second stage was marked by the abolition or reduction of mate-

[1] J. R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 131 (1903).

[2] Robert Hunter, "Relation between Social Settlements and Charity Organization," *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. XI, p. 76 (1902).

[3] During the eighties at least a dozen charity organization societies were organized and disbanded.

[4] From a conference with Mr. Alexander Johnson.

rial relief and the seeking of it by coöperation with other benevolent agencies, and the third by the engrafting on the charity organization societies of such activities as employment agencies, and provident schemes.[1]

An inquiry into the causes of the various local setbacks reveals several probable explanations. One was doubtless that of allowing the new society to drift into relief-giving. A second reason was scarcity of trained workers. A society would flourish, but if it lost the personal influence of a good secretary or two or three leading volunteers, it would often languish and coöperation and friendly visiting would languish also. Where a society had been able to command the services of those who had mastered the principles and technique of charity organization, it had "taken root and won support to its standards." [2] As corroborative of this is the further evidence that in those societies where there had been inefficiency, the employment of a paid and expert superintendent had been found to put an end to feebleness and inefficiency. Of the twelve societies [3] that are known to have lapsed during the eighties, the majority were located in smaller towns, while of the societies that failed to report to the International Congress of Charities of 1893, most on the list were societies located in small communities where the lack of trained leaders and of suitable friendly visitors were often conspicuous by their absence.

In the earliest days the desire to economize coupled with the fear of pauperizing unfortunately caused some societies to be viewed as devices for saving the taxpayer, and secured for them the title "Society for the Suppres-

[1] Charles D. Kellogg, "History of Charity Organization in the United States," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 20th session, p. 63 (1893).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

[3] Altoona, Pa.; Chicago; Columbus, Ohio; Dedham, Mass.; District of Columbia; Lowell, Mass.; Moline, Ill.; Paterson, N. J.; Princeton, N. J.; Quincy, Ill.; Sandusky, Ohio; St. Joseph, Mo.

sion of Benevolence." Failure to educate the public to their true aims and methods then as now proved a considerable obstacles to progress.[1]

A characteristic feature of the years under review was the inauguration by a number of societies of industrial and educational activities. Of the pioneer societies none surpassed that in Buffalo in the range of activities undertaken. To its day's work it soon added the maintenance of employment bureaus, woodyards, laundries, workrooms, wayfarers' lodges, special schools, loan societies, penny banks, fuel societies, crèches, district nursing, sick diet kitchens and an accident hospital.

Industrial agencies, such as work exchanges, woodyards, workrooms and laundries soon became a distinguishing feature of the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities.[2] The Orange Bureau of Charities not only ran a laundry, but sold coal and groceries to the poor as near wholesale price as possible. The Washington Society founded a school for the training of girls for domestic service, and established sewing classes, free kindergartens, nurseries and a woodyard. The Cleveland Associated Charities established an employment bureau in 1886 which enjoyed a continuous existence for a number of years.[3] In the same year the Minneapolis Society established a similar bureau destined to do a flourishing business, the number of jobs given to men and women running in one year as

[1] As illustrative of this is the following sentence uttered at the eighth annual meeting of the New York Society, "There is, I am sorry to say, an impression which is not confined to a few people, that the Charity Organization Society which has as its motto, 'Not alms but a friend,' should have put there, 'Neither alms nor a friend.'" Address by Rev. E. W. Donald, D.D., see 8th Annual Report of the Charity Organization Society of New York City (1890).

[2] These agencies with the exception of the work exchange which operated but a few years were founded between 1883 and 1896.

[3] There seems to be a tendency for such bureaus to be conducted as an accommodation to the public rather than as an aid to good case work. For this reason coupled with the belief that it is a function of government to provide free employment facilities, the Cleveland Society abolished its employment bureau in 1912.

high as 10,513.[1] Still other societies, especially that in Indianapolis, became noted for their extra activities.

It is not surprising that a number of societies should have looked upon devices for the encouragement of thrift as a legitimate part of their program. The thrift features of the work of Octavia Hill had shown the possibilities of such schemes. Mention has already been made of the work of the Newport and Buffalo societies in this field. In order to develop the habit of thrift in children and among adults not reached by savings banks, the New York Society in 1888 established its Penny Provident Fund. By the close of the period under review approximately twenty-five societies had instituted provident savings banks, usually as departments of the local society. The system of stamp savings which was subsequently taken up in a number of other places was started in almost every instance by charity organization societies.[2]

Interest in Remedial Loans

Although the function of a loan agency is quite different from that of a provident fund, it is also not surprising that charity organization societies have ever taken an interest in the protection of small borrowers. The pawnbroker shop and salary loan agencies have their roots in the soil of necessity. They are the poor man's bankers. Realizing that it is often more important that the poor should be able to borrow than the rich, and that the commercialized pawnbroker shop was often one of the worst exploiters of the poor, a number of societies soon took steps to aid persons in need of pecuniary assistance, by loans of money at interest, upon the pledge or mortgage of personal property. In 1888 the Relief Society of St.

[1] Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Associated Charities of Minneapolis, p. 22 (1909).

[2] Joseph Lee, "Preventive Work," *Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 384 (1900).

Paul established a loan department on a small scale, while there was incorporated in Boston the Workingmen's Loan Association, the first company in the country founded as a semi-philanthropic enterprise, to lend money on property remaining in the possession of the borrower.[1] The latter enterprise was not launched as an organic part of the local Associated Charities, but came as the result of the initiative of its president, Robert Treat Paine, Jr., who had begun the experiment the year before with $10,000 of his own. Its plan consisted in lending money on chattel mortgage (almost entirely on household furniture) at a rate of one per cent. a month. It pays six per cent. dividends as well as taxes, and has been able to lay up a surplus sufficient to guarantee against danger from bad loans or bad times. It has proven a formidable competitor to all local "loan sharks."

By the early nineties the modern movement for the protection of small borrowers was well begun. It was on the initiative of the New York Charity Organization Society, after it had investigated the evils of the old time unregulated pawnshop, that the founders of the Provident Loan Society obtained its special act of incorporation in face of what seemed like insurmountable opposition to the so-called "Vanderbilt pawnshop." Thus was launched in 1894 the Provident Loan Society, a humanitarian pawnshop conducted on strict business principles in which, however, the lowest rate of interest is charged consistent with good business management, and a return of simple interest on money invested and in which the largest possible encouragement is given to the redemption of pledges by receiving payments in instalments.[2] Although the

[1] The company did not begin actual business until April, 1889. The Collateral Loan Company of Boston, a pawnshop, was organized in 1859 as a business institution, but it has always contented itself with the payment of a reasonable dividend.

[2] Beginning with a modest capital of $100,000, the society was operating in 1918 on a contributed capital of $7,200,000. The equipment has increased from a one room office to twelve large offices, eleven of them in buildings owned by the society without mortgage. The loans in 1918 amounted to $23,000,000. For business reasons it was organized as a

object of the new society, as stated in its act of incorporation and in its constitution, was "to aid such persons as the society shall deem in need of pecuniary assistance, by loans of money at interest, upon the pledge or mortgage of personal property," its real purpose has ever been to prevent the abuses and exploitation of the old-fashioned pawnshop and to protect those who need loans without having the kind of collateral security which would be demanded by an ordinary bank. In 1912 the stockholders of the Provident Loan Society supplemented its work by organizing a Chattel Loan Society, a similar institution to make small loans upon security of mortgages on household furniture.

Since the beginning of the movement for humanitarian loan funds, charity organization societies throughout the country have almost without exception either organized the local loan fund or coöperated actively in its organization. It was largely the experience in remedial loan work begun in Baltimore mainly through the influence of the local charity organization society that led the Russell Sage Foundation to establish in 1909 its Division of Remedial Loans. So far as the writer is able to ascertain, charity organization societies are to-day closely in touch with the local member of the National Federation of Remedial Loan Associations [1] in every city in which one is in operation.

The Problem of the Homeless Man

The unemployed able-bodied man, often without family, presented to the early societies a problem which seemed to many to require special machinery. These

separate business. As an evidence of the historic connection between the two societies, each year the New York C. O. S. selects one of its directors.

[1] An association launched in 1909 and affiliated with the National Conference of Social Work. Its members, though operating a business organization, are required to limit their possible dividends in accordance with the investment standard existing in their respective communities.

societies often provided some systematic form of relief by offering employment in stone breaking, street work or woodyards, usually the last. These were usually regarded as "work-tests." Such men were often in need of temporary sleeping quarters. It was customary in many places for them to find lodging at police stations or in free shelters having no "work test." The Philadelphia Society early recognized the evils of such a solution and so opened several wayfarers' lodges and secured an act of legislature which recognized them as desirable substitutes for police lodgings. The law empowered the city authorities to close the station-houses as sleeping places, and gave the lodge superintendents the right to arrest any men who refused to do woodyard work in exchange for the care given. The city authorities took advantage of this plan to reduce vagrancy and closed the station-houses to lodgers until they were again thrown open during the crisis of 1893 and 1894. Since municipal lodging houses were largely unknown, similar wayfarers' lodges were opened, often under the direct control of the local charity organization society, in a number of cities.

Woodyards and temporary shelters were also frequently used to curb the evils of street begging and vagrancy, problems which loom large in the period under review. Some of the most constant work in this direction was that undertaken by the New York Society which, as early as 1883, appointed special officers to coöperate with the Police Department of the city in solving the problem. This service was continued until 1897, just previous to which the city established a police detail of twelve men to form a "vagrancy squad." [1]

Doubtless a big factor in the attempts of many societies to rid their respective communities of the evil of giving indiscriminately to beggars was the fact that almost every citizen had been visited by the poor that beg, and they felt that it was important to *begin* their

[1] See p. 313.

propagandist work at this point, since few had ever visited the poor in their homes.[1] The appreciation of this pedagogical principle of beginning with the known probably explains why the suppression of begging received in the propagandist literature of the eighties a larger proportion of space than it received in the work itself.[2]

The limitations of space forbid a more detailed rehearsal of all the various "extra" activities undertaken by many of the societies between 1882 and 1896. Suffice it to point out that societies generally during this period disclosed a tendency to add to the day's work many new activities whose special watchword was prevention.[3]

The difference in the kinds of activities depended largely on the previous charitable development of the community in which the respective society existed.[4] There was furthermore in most communities a scarcity of leadership in the social field. If the local charity

[1] From the beginning the wrong done to the beggar was of course a controlling factor. Instead of the suppression of begging being viewed as a negative aspect of the work of a charity organization society, it is viewed as quite the opposite. "The first plank in a positive program," writes Dr. Devine in his report to the National Conference of Charities and Correction in 1899, "is the awakening of a desire to change this unnatural and abominable relation between the beggar and his patron." "Organization of Charity," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 26th session, p. 278 (1899).

[2] See Philip W. Ayers, "Relief in Work" (a study of ninety societies). *The Charities Review,* Vol. II, p. 35 (1892).

[3] James M. Pullman, "The Development of Charity Organization," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. XI, p. 424 (1893).

The Charity Organization Review, London (Feb., 1893), pointed out that what impressed them most in reading the views of Americans on social difficulties and efforts to amend them was their readiness to try many schemes and their energetic hopefulness. "There is at least no stagnation in their work, no tendency to keep in one groove, but a vigorous, quick growth, with its advantages and disadvantages. The field of work carried on under the auspices of their C. O. S. is enormous." See *The Charities Review,* Vol. II, p. 282 (1892).

[4] "Here they did so [entered upon various activities] because they could not secure the coöperation of established agencies necessary to their plan; there they did so to provide instrumentalities adapted to conditions for which no previous arrangements had been made; now they did so from a spirit of self-aggrandizement. Hence in their reports one may find accounts of employment bureaus, of woodyards, of wayfarers' lodges, of special schools, of loans, of fuel societies, and of grants of food and clothing." D. O. Kellogg, "The Function of Charity Organization," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. I, p. 453 (1886).

organization society had not led in these newer fields which often represented a groping desire to get back to some of the causes of misery, such movements would have doubtless died at birth. During the eighties and well into the nineties the field of social work was a large and undifferentiated one. The charity organization society of this period held a unique position. Many tasks which might then have logically come within its purview have since been assigned more logically and wisely to other organizations. Before the era of specialization in social work there were therefore extenuating circumstances for the practice. Even at the time not all societies undertook these functions but contented themselves with stimulating others to undertake them and many others have since discontinued them, believing that they absorbed too much time and energy.

Another extenuating circumstance, at least in some communities was the need for popular support which these extra activities offered. Day nurseries, diet kitchens, woodyards, sewing rooms and laundries, free employment bureaus, and penny provident funds commended themselves to most benevolent individuals as soon as their objects were stated. They were all clearly practical. The main features of charity organization, namely, investigation, registration, and coöperation, were by no means so attractive at the first glance. Some charity organization societies often gained therefrom a popular support for their work which might otherwise have been impossible.

Disaster Relief

Charity organization societies early afforded demonstrations of no mean magnitude of the value of their methods in disaster relief.[1] Four instances are outstanding. As a result of a disastrous flood in the Ohio River

[1] For a statement of the applicability of charity organization principles to disasters, see J. Byron Deacon, "Disasters" (1918).

valley, in 1884, the city of Cincinnati was confronted with the problem of organizing at a day's notice, a commissary department for an army of 22,000 men, women and children driven out of their homes by the flood or driven to the upper stories of their houses, and whose ordinary sources of food were entirely cut off. To feed that army to begin with, and then later, another army as large, of men whose means of living were totally cut off and destroyed by the cessation of work in the bottoms, was the task before the city at that time. Such, however, was accomplished through the local Associated Charities [1] which aided by citizens and a committee of business men who collected the funds and bought the provisions,[2] undertook the work of distribution.

The value of the principles of charity organization were again demonstrated on a relatively large scale at the great fire that occurred in Lynn, Mass., in 1889. The local Associated Charities was again immediately recognized as the one center of information and registration. While the fire was still burning, one of the society's workers, in company with the agent of the principal relief-giving society, canvassed the burned district and outlined a plan of work whose value was increased by the fact that many of the burned-out families were known to the Associated Charities.

Again, in Louisville, after the severe tornado of 1890, the local society was used by the Chamber of Commerce in accomplishing a most splendid piece of charitable administration. The charity organization society's agents served as visitors-in-chief for the guidance of the bands of relief workers for those made homeless. Every family injured was aided to the extent of its material loss, and a balance was left in the treasury. The New York Society had its first experience in emergency relief

[1] Two years previous the society had gained valuable experience during an epidemic of smallpox.

[2] W. Alexander Johnson, Familiar Letters on Charity Organization, *The Monthly Register,* Vol. VII, p. 44 (1886).

work in the Park Place disaster of 1891. Sixty-three families suffered bereavement by the collapse of a building. The victim in many cases was the head of the family. "It is an indication of the esteem in which the Society was held that both the Mayor's relief committee and a leading local newspaper requested it to act as intermediary in distributing the funds of $30,000, and $7,000 which had been raised."[1] Other cases might be cited. Suffice it to say that before the close of the period under review the value of having in every community a corps of workers trained in scientific methods of disaster relief was increasingly appreciated.

Philanthropic Publication

Charity organization propagandist work was carried on during the early eighties "by the organization of conferences for the comparison of experiences and opinions, and for the intercourse one with another of workers and thinkers; by the wide correspondence entered upon; and by the profuse dissemination of literature.[2] As early as 1880 the Philadelphia Society began the publication of the *Monthly Register* to disseminate "information on questions relating to the welfare of the depressed" and to stir up "a deeper interest in benevolent works." By 1882 it had become the official organ of charity organization societies in twelve other cities.

Although for several years thereafter it continued to be published as the organ of the movement throughout the country, it could not long claim a monopoly. In 1884 the New York Society began the publication of a *Monthly Bulletin* as "a confidential communication to all its members and constituents." The need of a truly official organ

[1] Lilian Brandt, "The Charity Organization Society of the City of New York," 1882-1907, published by the Society as its Twenty-fifth Annual Report, p. 30.

[2] D. O. Kellogg, "The Function of Charity Organization," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. I, p. 451 (1886).

for the spread of right principles and methods in charitable work led in 1886 a number of the leaders of the charity organization societies of New York, Philadelphia and Boston [1] to coöperate with Edward Everett Hale, the well-known author of "A Man Without a Country," in launching *Lend-a-Hand,* "a record of progress and journal of organized charity." [2] It was the hope of its editor, Mr. Hale, that it should serve as a "Clearing-House," which should receive from every society engaged in public improvement an account of its achievements and of its wants. Although the magazine reprinted and gave added circulation to some good papers presented to the National Conference of Charities and Correction, besides current notes and occasional papers on charitable work, it never was, unfortunately, as great an influence as its editor, who was then, and until his death, a strong personal force in arousing and stimulating individuals to service.[3] Later in the decade came the unsuccessful attempt to found the *International Record of Charities and Correction,* and the successful publication in Chicago by Mr. Alexander Johnson of the *Reporter of Organized Charity.* Ten thousand copies a month were printed of the *Reporter,* of which several hundred were distributed by mail and the remainder by hand each month, in a different section of the city, so that in four months the business center and the north, south and west sides of the residential districts were covered. In spite of the fact that the venture promised to carry itself financially, and accomplished much in the way of publicity, its publication was discontinued in a little over a year (September 1889).[4]

[1] In addition to having the regular editorial assistance of the central directors of charity organization in New York, Philadelphia and Boston, assurance of the coöperation of those supporting the charity organization work in Brooklyn, Newark, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, Cambridge, Lynn and a number of other cities was secured.

[2] *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. I, p. 1 (1886).

[3] J. R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 136 (1903).

[4] The Charity Organization Society of Chicago had promised to subscribe for 1500 copies at the rate of 50 cents per annum. However, in

In 1888 *The Council: a Monthly Essay on Organized Charity,* began publication under the auspices of the short-lived "Council of Charity Officers," to which reference will presently be made. In the early nineties, the Baltimore Society launched *The Charities Record,*[1] a quarterly journal of the progress of Baltimore's charities. To meet the more specific need for the adequate expression and exchange of opinion and information in the field of charitable and social endeavor, the New York Society founded in November, 1891, with John H. Finley as editor, *The Charities Review,* as a monthly magazine, "not only of local, but of national interest to all workers in charity and correction." In 1897, *Lend-a-Hand,* to which reference has just been made, was merged with it.

Two books of wide influence which owe their origin to the movement in the period under review deserve mention here. They are *The Tribe of Ishmael* written by Oscar C. McCulloch in 1888, and *American Charities,* which Amos G. Warner wrote six years later. During years of service with the Indianapolis Society, Mr. McCulloch had been impressed with the frequency with which a certain family name of central Indiana kept recurring in his record of "cases." Genealogical research revealed the fact that the progenitor of this tribe, Ben Ishmael (name fictitious), had been in Kentucky as far back as 1790, having come from Maryland through Kentucky. One of his sons, John, had married a half-breed woman and had come into Marion County, Indiana, about 1840. His three sons had married three sisters from a pauper family named Smith, having had altogether 14 children that survived, 60 grandchildren, and 30 great-grandchildren, who were still living at the time the study was made. Since 1840 this family had had a

October, 1889, the C. O. S. amalgamated with the local Relief and Aid Society (see p. 224) and the publication was discontinued.

[1] After a useful existence of fourteen years the publication was discontinued.

pauper record. They had been in the almshouse, the House of Refuge, the Woman's Reformatory, the penitentiaries, and had received continuous aid from the townships. In their family history were murderers, a large number of illegitimacies and of prostitutes. They were generally diseased. The children died young. They lived by petty stealing, begging and ash-gathering.[1] Mr. McCulloch's first-hand study of degeneracy in this family served to call social workers' attention again, and this time in most striking fashion to the problem of feeble-mindedness which, like devil-grass, underran some of their most baffling case problems.[2] It has required, however, the development of a more thorough knowledge of heredity with the development of mental tests to bring about the changes in the methods of diagnosis and treatment that are beginning to characterize much of modern social work with this type of case.

[1] Summary from C. B. Davenport, "Heredity in Relation to Eugenics," p. 234 (1911).

[2] Here and there one finds evidence that individuals identified with the movement and even societies appreciated the significance of the hereditary factors in the problems confronting them. In 1876 Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell, later founder of the New York Charity Organization Society wrote: "Even a casual perusal of this report [the tenth Annual Report of the New York State Board of Charities] will convince the reader that one of the most important and most dangerous causes of the increase of crime, pauperism and insanity is the unrestricted liberty allowed vagrant and degraded women." Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell, "One Means of Preventing Pauperism," Tenth Annual Report, New York State Board of Charities (1876).

In 1877 came the famous study by R. L. Dugdale, "The Jukes, a study in crime, pauperism, disease, and heredity," first published in the 30th annual report of the New York Prison Association in 1877. Latest edition, 1910.

In 1880 the Boston society published a two page leaflet (publication No. 32) reprinted in 1883 entitled "How Pauperism becomes Hereditary."

In 1881 Mr. Seth Low, then President of the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, pointed out at the National Conference of Charities and Correction the need for care of epileptics and provision of the feeble-minded.

In 1886 *The Monthly Register* called attention to the fact "that no defective or imbecile is harmless, and that the safety of posterity requires such legal isolation as shall defend these against their own defects and the assaults of the unprincipled." *Monthly Register,* Vol. VII, p. 88 (1886).

The author of the second book, Amos G. Warner, had been identified with charity organization work in Baltimore and later in the District of Columbia. His book *American Charities,* a study of philanthropy and economics, was the first comprehensive and authoritative statement of the problems of charity published in America.

A Forerunner of the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work

In 1889 an interesting attempt was made looking toward standardization of charity organization methods, when there was organized the "Council of Charity Officers," a voluntary body composed of practically all the chief paid executive secretaries of the charity organization societies of the country.[1] Its purpose was to provide:

(1) A central registration, at Buffalo, N. Y., of all travelling mendicants and impostors, based upon reports from all affiliated societies in the United States.
(2) The preparation of a telegraphic code for charitable inquirers.
(3) The compilation of a primer of organized charity for educational use at new centers.
(4) A plan to secure uniform information concerning methods and results from all kindred societies, as a basis for intelligent action upon the social problems which confront them.
(5) An effort to introduce the teaching of Charity Organization principles and methods into high schools, colleges and seminaries.[2]

As a part of the above program the Council of Charity Officers issued a confidential circular which, among other

[1] Alexander Johnson, general secretary of the Chicago Charity Organization Society, was president and N. E. Rosenau, general secretary of the Buffalo Society, was secretary.

[2] Chas. D. Kellogg, "Organization of Charities," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 14th session, p. 128 (1887).

things, disclosed big frauds, who were travelling throughout the country. This was distributed to the members of the Council only.[1]

As an aid to its work, *The Council: a Monthly Essay on Organized Charity,* edited by its president, was founded the next year (1888) under its auspices. Because of the great demand from societies everywhere for tracts on the subject of charity organization, *The Council* reprinted each month some good article which had appeared in the *Reporter,* previously mentioned.[2]

That the "Council of Charity Officers" was ahead of the times is evidenced by the fact that only two societies, namely, the C. O. S. of Terre Haute and the C. O. S. of New York City,[3] subscribed to *The Council* which, after ten numbers ceased, and the Council of Charity Officers came to an end with the central registration of mendicants and impostors as the only part of its program accomplished. That it contained a vital idea is proven by the success of the National Association of Societies for Organizing Charity launched in 1911, on broader but not greatly dissimilar lines.

Of the societies organized during the period under review, those in Denver, Colorado (1887), and St. Paul, Minn. (1892), deserve special mention, because of their unusual forms of organization. Special reference will also be made to the unique plan of church coöperation inaugurated by the Buffalo Society during the closing year of the period.

[1] It was carefully kept from publication. About five or six numbers were issued, not more than fifty or sixty of each being printed.

[2] It is estimated that one tract by Robert Treat Paine, Jr., had a circulation that amounted to half a million, and another four page leaflet by Francis Wayland of over 200,000. Letter from Mr. Alexander Johnson to author of date of September 18th, 1914.

[3] The New York Society took a thousand copies each month; 650 were sent by mail from Chicago to its subscribers. The remaining 350 copies were distributed from the central office of the New York Society. The Terre Haute Society took 200 copies a month, which it distributed personally as charity tracts.

The Denver System

Although a child of the Indianapolis Society, the Denver Charity Organization Society differed markedly from its parent in form of organization.[1] Because the business men of Denver demanded "that the charitable institutions asking aid in their work should solicit funds through a central agency, and should organize for efficiency and for the prevention of duplication in their work," [2] the new organization though bearing the name the Denver Charity Organization Society,[3] began as a federation of fifteen societies and institutions. The central office of these affiliated organizations, modelled somewhat on the lines of the Indianapolis Society, performed the functions of a charity organization society. It, however, did not provide for granting material relief from its funds. As the method of raising its funds marked the beginning of the introduction into this country of the so-called "Liverpool System" of finance,[4] a method of joint appealing at one time for all the charities of a city

[1] Its first president, Rev. Myron W. Reed, had had at one time a church in Indianapolis where he had been much impressed with the work of the local society under the leadership of the Rev. Oscar C. McCulloch.

[2] Twenty-third Annual Report of the Charity Organization Society of Denver (1910), p. 5.

[3] The name was changed in 1911 to the United Charities as more consistent with its form of organization.

[4] In 1873 it was discovered that the 38 leading charities of Liverpool were being supported by only 6,600 persons when it was estimated that 20,000 persons were able to contribute. Moreover, it was further discovered that the bulk of giving was done by about one-third of the givers, the same names reappearing on a great number of the lists. On the basis of these facts the various charities were not united in administration but were induced to present their claims through one office and on one sheet. At the beginning of each year a list of charities guaranteed by a central committee as worthy of help is distributed to the charitable public, and on this sheet each subscriber sets down and divides at his discretion his charity subscription for the year. From those who are well disposed but unacquainted with any special form of charity, a general subscription is asked to be distributed at the discretion of the central committee. See Francis G. Peabody, "The Problem of Charity," *Charities Review,* Vol. III, p. 11 (1893).

among whom the fund raised is subsequently divided, its details merit elaboration. The total revenue of the federation was distributed in monthly installments to the various constituent members by the executive committee. It was the understanding of the societies thus receiving money from the federation that in return for this assistance they would not solicit from the citizens who were contributors to the general fund. They might, however, ask aid of others and might accept donations from friends of the institutions.[1]

Beside the economy of effort, it was pointed out that such a plan would result in a more equitable distribution of the so-called "charitable fund" of the community. Some philanthropic enterprises by their very nature make a stronger appeal for popular support than others, which may be equally or even more socially useful. The first annual report of the society states that the experiment which was begun the year previous with some feeling of distrust, had proven to be "a great boon to both the givers and recipients of relief." "It is not," the report continues, "an exaggeration to say that the amount of $20,000 distributed through the channels of the charity organizations of this city have saved the citizens of Denver thousands of dollars, and the relief has been systematic, rapid and judicious."

The later working of the plan revealed defects in it at first not noticeable. The most serious arose from the fact that the plan had its roots almost exclusively in a desire for economy and the saving of the giving public from annoyance. It did not sufficiently stress coöperation, community planning and high standards of work,

[1] That abuses arose under this plan is attested by the fact that the executive committee in the course of time was compelled to pass the following resolution: "Believing that methods employed by individuals in raising money for charitable purposes threaten to discredit our institution, be it resolved, that the various coöperating societies counsel with the executive committee before undertaking any plan to raise money." Anon., "Organized Charity at Work: Denver," *Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 491 (1900).

especially in the field of family case work. Even the plan of raising through one fund all the money for the social agencies of the city broke down. Although the money received about covered the expenses of the constituent agencies during the early nineties, the increase in the size of the central fund soon failed to keep pace with the increase of their needs.[1] Where a member society received but a small part of its total income from the central fund, as was true of more than one of the affiliated societies, it came to view its subscription from the general fund as simply one of its various subscriptions, and so probably felt under no particular obligation to the central committee for its financial methods.

Still more serious from the point of view of local family case work was the fact that every one of the societies, excepting the central office to which, as already noted, were delegated the functions of a charity organization society, was free to go to non-subscribers for financial aid. With this contact removed and income necessarily curtailed, coöperation between the central office and the community was reduced to almost a vanishing point. This resulted "in sucking all the life out of the central office." [2] Thus in the depression of '93-'94 the obligations to provide for the coöperating societies according to their needs prevented the central office from formulating any special plan of emergency relief.[3]

As will be noted later, the Denver Federation for Char-

[1] By 1900 the proportion of funds raised by the central agency was but forty-five per cent. In 1910 it was less than twenty-nine per cent. See Twenty-third Annual Report of the Charity Organization Society of Denver, p. 7 (1910). An element in this decrease seems to have been the acceptance of a public subsidy which was accompanied by a drying up of the sources of private benevolence.

[2] Quoted by L. A. Halbert in "Effective Charity Administration." "Annals of the Amer. Academy of Political and Social Science," Vol. XLI, pp. 176-192 (1912).

[3] "The coöperating societies and institutions receive amounts according to their needs. With such obligations resting upon us, we were unable to formulate any special plan of relief last winter." Izetta George. "Denver's Plan," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, p. 55 (1894).

ity and Philanthropy, as it was afterward called, has in recent years undergone considerable reorganization.[1]

The St. Paul Plan

The St. Paul Associated Charities, organized in 1892, reintroduced into the movement a plan of organization with which its name was long associated, already tried for short periods in Boston and Minneapolis. It will be recalled that the original constitution of the Boston Society (that adopted provisionally in 1879) was on a delegate plan. In as large a city as Boston it proved too clumsy. The change to a board of directors was made in 1881, although many of the features of the earlier plan were retained.

Briefly, the St. Paul plan consisted in having a central council composed of representatives from those approved charitable institutions of the city which contributed adequately to its support. These representatives or delegates, with several others chosen at large and several ex-officio members chose the trustees of the Associated Charities which in turn investigated for each agency in the federation. In time the plan outlived its usefulness in St. Paul. In 1914 the Associated Charities went out of existence and the United Charities, built on the usual C. O. S. plan of organization, with Board of Directors elected by members of the organization, was formed.

The Church District Plan

The older societies in the main adhered to their established forms of organization. The Buffalo Society proved an exception when it inaugurated the closing year of the period under review a system of coöperation with local churches known in charity organization circles as the "Church District Plan." It merits notice if for no other reason than that it was inaugurated at a time

[1] See p. 434.

when "the lack of intimate relations with the churches was especially noticeable" [1] not only in Buffalo, but quite generally throughout the country.[2]

The Buffalo Society had succeeded in enrolling practically no friendly visitors, although many churches were using friendly visitors with their own poor families. Even when such families were known to the society there was no connection between the society and the visitor. Furthermore, there were no relief societies in the city, except those for special classes, like the Hebrew Board of Charities. The problem of finding adequate relief for dependent families was a grave one. The Charity Organization Society had funds for emergency aid only, and the city fund was not too carefully administered. On the other hand, the relief work of many of the churches did not begin to exhaust their means. The wealthiest churches had the fewest poor, and had undertaken little work outside their own membership. Moreover, the relief work of many of the churches when not confined to their own poor, was often done scatteringly and unsystematically. There was practically no concentration of effort upon definite areas, and consequently much overlapping of work. Moreover, of the type of constructive social work represented by settlements and boys' clubs, the city had practically none. Lacking this, and also friendly visitors, the Society could not bring to bear upon the poor the continuous personal influence which is often so great an aid to self-help. An added reason for seeking the coöperation of the churches was a more or less general distrust of the local Charity Organization Society, because of its emphasis upon investigation and registration. In short, it was the recognition of the fact that churches constitute a source of most harmful relief when

[1] Brackett, Jeffery R., "The Charity Organization Movement," *Charities Review,* Vol. IV, p. 395 (1895).

[2] This was before the modern movement for the socialization of the church as represented in the Federal Council of Christian Churches in America. In 1911 we find the first organic relation between the National Conference of Social Work and the church.

uncoöperative,[1] and a great help in treatment both as a source of material relief and as a channel through which to enlist the services of volunteers and friendly visitors that led the Buffalo Society to evolve its "Church District Plan." [2]

The plan consisted in dividing the city into over one hundred districts, with special reference to the location of churches and relieving agencies. The districts were so small that few involved the care of more than a dozen families. For this reason the work of the churches in their districts could be individual.[3] Each district was assigned to a church. The churches entering the plan agreed to care for every family otherwise uncared for by an individual, organization or other church. When a family needing care had a definite church connection that church was asked to provide the necessary visitor and such needed material relief as it could afford. Each church accepting a district promised to assume a special responsibility for the moral elevation of its district, through friendly visiting to referred families and such other agencies as settlements, clubs, classes, etc., as it

[1] "The duty of the Church to dependency must be defined before any community can treat, ameliorate, and control it in a logical and thoughtful way." Frank Tucker, "The Report of the Committee on the Care and Relief of Needy Families in their Homes," *Charities,* Vol. VII, p. 44, (1901).

To a large extent . . . the churches and religious societies pursue an antiquated and short-sighted policy, giving relief from sentimental motives without personal knowledge of its effect upon those who receive it, and oftentimes in the hope that possible converts may be attracted through this means. The criticism applies with particular force to missions, to posts of the Salvation Army, Church Army Volunteers, and other organizations which aim to reach the outcast and the neglected, and is defended on the ground that in no way can they gain the attention and confidence of those whom they would rescue. E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," pp. 329-336 (1904).

[2] For the statements just made as to the status of the charity organization work in Buffalo, many of which are almost verbatim, the author is indebted to a paper read by Mr. Porter R. Lee, then Assistant Secretary of the Buffalo Society, at the 29th Annual Meeting of the Society, held 1906. See Tenth Annual Report of the Committee on Coöperation of the Charity Organization Society of Buffalo, pp. 20-21 (1906).

[3] In 1909 the number of districts was reduced to 37. Thirty-fourth Annual Report p. 6 (1911).

could establish. In all districts the Charity Organization Society made the original investigation itself, but after that surrendered the family absolutely.[1]

Space will not permit a detailed account of the difficulties encountered in working out the plan, nor a rehearsal of their adjustment,[2] but it remains to add in this connection that, by 1901, five years after the plan began, 25 more churches had accepted districts, and in 1903 thirty more; in 1906 there were 122 coöperating churches. Of the English-speaking churches there was hardly one of importance which was not included. Twenty-seven churches in the well-to-do district of the city had had previous connection with the district chosen, through chapels, missions, or otherwise. By 1906, six social settlements with residents, and six social centers without residents had been opened by the coöperating churches. Of the 165 friendly visitors which the society could then claim, 85 had been assigned by denominational churches or were men and women who had them-

[1] Comment on this plan can be found in Washington Gladden's "The Christian Pastor," pp. 467-473 (1898); in his "Social Salvation," pp. 46-49 (1902); and in *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 204 (1901).

[2] At first the mechanism of the plan was faulty; neglect was not promptly corrected, and district committees often hesitated or refused to refer families to some churches because the charity work of some of the churches was so unintelligent, doubling the labor of the committee referring the case, and by delay frequently increasing the suffering of the poor.

A rule was adopted in 1899 abolishing the discretion of the district committees and requiring the reference of all families residing within the assigned districts. The stand the Society took in the matter was that if apathy, indolence and ignorance existed among some of the churches, it was the function of the C. O. S. to transmute apathy into interest, indolence into responsible activity and ignorance into wise charity. A committee on coöperation met monthly to hear complaints, and poor coöperation was reported at once to the member of the committee who represented the denomination concerned, without waiting for the monthly meeting.

In 1911 there were 37 churches of all denominations who were undertaking to supply friendly visitors, and if possible money aid for neglected poverty of any faith within their districts. During the year details of the plan were improved. The belief was expressed that the plan could never be what it should be until the Society had a special church secretary to give it the attention it deserved. See Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Society, pp. 16-17 (1911).

selves made the first contact with their families. The churches' distrust of the Charity Organization Society was materially changed as evidenced by the increasing number of investigations which the society made at the request of individuals and churches.

In spite of all that the plan accomplished and its promise of still greater things in the way of church coöperation in community work it did not come up to expectations. Except in conspicuous instances, the churches were able to raise little relief except for any but their own poor. By 1901 the Charity Organization Society had raised considerably its own standard of relief giving. Subsequently, if a family requiring liberal continuous aid was assigned to a church of small means, the Society had to come to its rescue.[1]

Organizing churches for social service has been tried elsewhere but its success has been uneven. In 1898 there was a movement started in Cambridge, Massachusetts, by a clergyman of the city looking toward the introduction of the Church District Plan. Although the Associated Charities stood ready to coöperate, the plan never developed much beyond a paper status. In 1903 there was a local adaptation of the plan in the northern district of Brooklyn where twenty-three of the fifty churches united to provide friendly visitors, each in a definite district. The plan was subsequently abandoned. On the other hand, in 1914 a Social Service Church Union was organized in Indianapolis, not as a separate organization, but as an instrument to supplement and extend the work of the local charity organization society. In a short

[1] Frederic Almy, "Coöperation of Churches in Charity," *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 205 (1901).

By 1919 the Church District Plan had practically gone out of use in Buffalo for several reasons. In a letter to the author under date of September 20th, 1919, Mr. Frederic Almy, Secretary of the Buffalo Charity Organization Society, said of it, "It has been a service in bringing much closer contact with many churches who used to look askance and I still believe it would work with fine results, if not on too large a scale, and with a competent secretary."

time seventy-eight churches, including Protestant, Catholic, Jewish and Unitarian, joined in the work, making a total of nearly 300 laymen engaged in social work through this one organization.

The Industrial Depression of 1893-1894

One of the most severe tests to which the movement for the organization of charity has ever been subjected, came when the panic of 1893, with its subsequent industrial depression, swept over the entire United States. Forty per cent. of the manufacturing establishments of the country shut down.[1] Making all due allowance for the tendency to exaggerate the number of unemployed which, with the hysteria usually accompanying a crisis, manifested itself in some quarters in the larger cities of the country, notably New York [2] and Boston,[3] the amount of unemployment was unprecedented. Historically this was the first time the homeless man figured largely in our national life. He became a national issue. It was the era of Coxey's and Kelly's and other industrial armies. The question of how work could be furnished for the unemployed was raised on all sides. It should be borne in mind that in spite of the vast numbers added to the ranks of charity, a study of the conditions showed, "to the immense credit of all concerned, that the workingmen and women understood their own business exceedingly well." In the main they did take care of themselves.[4] It was only

[1] Wilbur F. Crafts, "The New Charity and the newest," *Charities Review*, Vol. V, p. 21 (1895).

[2] Editorial, *Lend-a-Hand*, Vol. XIII, pp. 5-6 (1894).

[3] "Emergency Work in Boston during Winter 1893-1894," *Lend-a-Hand*, Vol. XIII, pp. 6-7 (1894).

[4] "Unemployed," *Lend-a-hand*, Vol. XII, p. 126 (1894). "But few union men apply for relief," the Central Relief Association of Chicago reported at the close of its activities in the emergency period of '93 and '94. "The majority of those who apply for and receive help from charitable institutions, or who worked for the Central Relief Association during the winter of '94," the report adds, "were men who have no trade, or are not well fitted to make a living at times when there is great depression in business." Report of the Central Relief

the long depression following the panic which gradually ate into the savings of the self-supporting that brought as many as were compelled to accept charitable relief.[1]

Although the number of places in which charity organization societies gained permanent footholds in 1893 exceeded the record held by any previous year since the beginning of the movement,[2] there were still less than one hundred societies throughout the entire country. The oldest of these were not two decades old, while more than half the number of societies had been in existence less than a decade. The burdens cast upon all were almost overwhelming. Except in these communities, the industrial depression that all but paralyzed industry, found the American people without any system of employment exchanges, and either without any machinery to handle a relief situation or with machinery so antiquated or inadequate as to be unequal to the strain placed upon it. In many of these communities as in the early seventies, relief was distributed in a reckless way, with several agencies dispensing in the same territory, duplicating, overlapping, wasting and, above all, often overlooking the most necessitous cases. The contrast presented by different communities in their efforts to meet the situation is most instructive. One or all of three general lines of action were used to meet the situation.

Charity Organization Societies and the Depression

First, there was the work of the permanent societies, notably the charity organization societies, relief or-

Association to the Civic Federation, to Its Contributors and the Public, p. 31. There were doubtless many who refused assistance because of the belief that "charity" was a concession by wealth to labor. See Editorial, *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. XIII, p. 5 (1894).

[1] In New York City over $2,000,000 was withdrawn from a single savings bank.

[2] This was due in part to the threatening storm of relief problems and also to the interest aroused in charity organization at the International Congress of Charities and Correction held in Chicago in 1893.

ganizations and the churches which roused themselves to enlarged operations. In some places, as in New York City, a conference was held early in the fall of '93 on the invitation of the Charity Organization Society at which the leading relief societies "united in a statement given to the public through the press, forecasting the probable demands of the winter and urging 'the charitably disposed' to make their gifts through the established charities of the city rather than by the indiscriminate alms which would 'inevitably tend to pauperize the recipients as well as to attract to the city an army of vagrants, in addition to numbers of the unemployed of other places.' " [1]

Where possible, charity organization societies employed many extra workers and utilized volunteer visitors. The administrative work of the Associated Charities in Boston more than doubled during the year. In New York the local society increased its working force about 50 per cent. and its expenses in the same proportion, including the establishment of an "Emergent Relief Guarantee," a fund to which $2,275 was pledged for the benefit of applicants to the society for whom adequate and suitable assistance could not be obtained from the usual charitable agencies. Even with enlarged forces the established agencies often found themselves greatly handicapped by the attitude of the press. In Boston, where an appeal deprecating the establishment of new agencies of relief and urging the public to contribute more liberally of money and personal service than ever before to the existing charities, was both published in nearly all the newspapers and widely distributed as a circular, the warning was not generally heeded, especially by the newspapers of the city. In New York City the newspapers set forth their own and others' undertakings in supplying free food, garments, shelter. "There was much of boastful publicity

[1] Lilian Brandt, "The Charity Organization Society of the City of New York," 1882-1907, published as the Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Society, pp. 34-35 (1907).

and fulsome self-adulation attending the schemes set on foot by journals, with the exception of the Tribune Coal and Food Fund. They drew crowds to their doors, composed of those who blushed at the exposure of their condition, or still more copiously of those who had long since ceased to blush. They sent wagons blazoned with their names and errands into crowded tenement streets, and called aloud the names of those for whom they had a charity package. In a word, they surrounded their work with conditions that repelled real merit, and lured the shameless to their doors and carts." . . .[1]

The result in New York City was that the distress native to the city, augmented by that attracted from the outside by these methods was such that the local Charity Organization Society found it impossible to record all the applicants who came: "The 'alms of direction' alone could be given to many hundred cases." [2] On the other hand in Philadelphia where there was less advertisement in the papers, less proclaiming to the poor that great things were being done for them and less tacit invitation to them to come on and be helped than in many other cities, the result was that, although destitution was widespread, and much suffering occurred, distress was relieved, and there was very little subsequent increase in pauperism.[3] The Citizens' Permanent Relief Committee, on which served representatives from the leading family agencies handled in the main the relief of the unemployed while the current work of the Society for Organizing Charity, though larger in volume, was carried on with effectiveness and without interruption.

To offset the pernicious influence of the newspapers and those well-intentioned but misguided citizens who

[1] Charles D. Kellogg, "The Situation in New York City During the Winter of 1893-1894," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 21st session, p. 29 (1894). See also *Charities Review,* Vol. III, pp. 239-243 (1893).

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 239.

[3] Frederic Almy, "The Problem of Charity," *Charities Review,* Vol. IV, p. 172 (1895).

advertised large relief funds for the unemployed, local societies in several instances, as in Louisville and New York City, erected Wayfarers' Lodges and laid in a large supply of wood, which was used to good advantage. The delay of the city authorities in providing a Municipal Lodging House, authorized by a statute, compelled the New York Society to open in November, 1893, a Wayfarers' Lodge in connection with its wood-yard, a model of its kind for that day, built from plans prepared after a careful investigation of similar buildings in Boston, Philadelphia, New Haven and Washington. It was utilized to the limit of its capacity. At the suggestion of the Society for several weeks, beginning the following January, all police station lodgers were regularly taken to court each morning and committed to the Commissioners of Charities and Correction for such treatment as the circumstances of each required, with the result of greatly reducing the number of "rounders" and controlling temporarily this form of indiscriminate relief.[1]

It need hardly be added that where a society as in Minneapolis maintained a free employment bureau, it was besieged by applicants for work. Here, unfortunately, as in the case of similar bureaus elsewhere, the number of jobs available decreased as the number of applicants increased.

Temporary Organizations Employing Charity Organization Methods

From the beginning, the problem was so largely one of unemployment that plans of relief through work were early put into operation, since experience had taught that relief without work is demoralizing and free soup kitchens and bread lines vicious. As the task was so great in cer-

[1] Lilian Brandt, "The Charity Organization Society of the City of New York," 1882-1907, published as the 25th Annual Report of the Society, p. 36 (1907).

tain larger cities, temporary organizations were formed and managed by persons skilled in the methods of charity organization and in ways of finding remunerative labor for those in need. In some instances charity organization societies themselves provided work.[1] These efforts constituted the second general line of action used to meet the situation.

Noteworthy among the temporary organizations formed were the East Side Relief Work Committee in New York City, the Central Relief Association in Chicago, the Citizens' Permanent Relief Committee [2] in Philadelphia and the Relief Committee of the Commercial Club of Indianapolis.

The East Side Relief Committee

The East Side Relief Work Committee was composed with few exceptions of representatives of such permanent bodies as settlements, churches, a district committee of the Charity Organization Society and a conference of St. Vincent de Paul. During the winter of 1893-94 this wisely conceived temporary committee did yeoman service in providing employment in workshops and elsewhere for some five thousand persons in New York

[1] For example, in Philadelphia the eighth and ninth ward associations of the Society set men to work cleaning some four hundred alleys and passageways of these wards, which it was not customary for the city to clean except when declared nuisances by the Board of Health. A special appeal for funds to carry on the work was issued. The response was prompt and liberal and half as much again as was asked for. The success and simplicity of the plan caused it to spread rapidly to neighboring wards. Joseph G. Rosengarten, "A Successful Experiment in Utilizing Labor," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, pp. 58-62 (1894).

At least nine societies in 1893-1894 and seven (some the same) in 1894-1895, provided emergency relief by work. By 1895 at least seventeen societies—a noticeable increase—maintained woodyards, workrooms or other agencies for directly providing relief by work. Jeffrey R. Brackett, "The Charity Organization Movement," *Charities Review*, Vol. IV, p. 395 (1895).

[2] In spite of the name, the Philadelphia Committee as augmented for the particular purposes of the emergency was a temporary organization.

City.[1] "It is reported by the charitable societies of the city that those who were aided by that Committee have very rarely been found since that winter among applicants for charitable relief." [2] Never before had charity organization principles been more effectively followed than by this organization, though but of a temporary nature.[3] "However necessary and useful in an emergency" such method of alleviating distress may have been it was nevertheless pointed out that it "should be adopted only under abnormal conditions," [4] such as existed in New York at the time.

As a result of the efforts of a number of public-spirited citizens, including clergymen and laymen, representing several Protestant bodies, the Roman Catholic Church and the Jewish faith, in the spring of 1894 the New York Employment Society was organized. Its purpose was the registration of men, the investigation of their references, as far as possible, and the securing of positions for those whose references for ability and character were satisfactory. It was a recognition of the fact that the problem of the able-bodied unemployed is not one for which the local charity organization society alone has responsibility.

The Central Relief Association of Chicago

With characteristic large-heartedness Chicago at first invited all who had no money to come and buy food and lodging "without money and without price." Contempo-

[1] For a carefully prepared statement of the essential features of the relief measures undertaken by this committee, see Josephine Shaw Lowell, "Five Months' Work for the Unemployed," *Charities Review*, Vol. III, p. 323 (1893). For a condensed statement of the foregoing, see Edward T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," pp. 412-419 (1904).

[2] E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," p. 463 (1904).

[3] Charles D. Kellogg, "The Situation in New York City during the Winter of 1893-94," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 21st session, p. 29 (1894).

[4] Josephine Shaw Lowell, "Five Months' Work for the Unemployed," *Charities Review*, Vol. III, p. 336 (1893).

raneous evidence indicates that the publicity given to her "good works" became in effect an advertisement for tramps. The "small dram-shops did an unusually flourishing business and the place became a Mecca for tramps and vagrants." [1] There was at this time in Chicago no charity organization society, nor had there been since 1886, when it had been "benevolently assimilated" by the local Relief and Aid Society. However, with sound sense, the good people, seeing the mistake of their "open-house" policy, faced about, organized December 14, 1893, a Central Relief Association, made willingness to work a test of "worthiness," divided the town into districts, and sent visitors out to find the needy in their homes. It was not the object of the Association to dispense material relief directly, but relieve distress as far as possible through existing organizations. Where these were wanting in efficiency, it stood ready to relieve directly or through other agencies to be created. Its plan of giving men an opportunity to return a fair equivalent in work for food, lodging and clothing proved "a most satisfactory method" [2] of dealing with the men who were floating about the city, many of whom were single men without homes.

An effort was promptly made so to regulate and systematize the operating of free soup houses, that a suitable labor test might be exacted of all who were fed and sheltered. The Association assumed control of several kitchens, where substantial food was exchanged for a quota of work on the streets. These kitchens, after having served well their purpose, were closed in the early spring. In view of the hindrance which the press had been in some communities, it is of interest to note that the Association acknowledged publicly that "its task would have been hopeless, but for the powerful aid cheer-

[1] Anon., "Relief by Extra Public Service," *The Charities Review,* Vol. III, p. 133 (1894).

[2] Report of the Central Relief Association to the Civic Federation, to its Contributors and the Public, p. 14.

fully rendered by the daily press in printing full reports of the work, and in donating space for notices explanatory of its needs and purposes." [1]

Out of the organization whose activities in behalf of the needy during the winter of 1893 and 1894 have just been described, there developed the Bureau of Charities, formally launched in 1894 as the residuary legatee of the emergency relief work just described.[2]

Established with the backing not only of some representative business men, but of leaders in the recently established University of Chicago, and in the social settlements, the new Bureau at once took a position of prominence which otherwise it could have reached but slowly. The part played by the settlements of Chicago in assisting the new "Bureau of Charities" is of interest, for although "settlement work historically grew out of charity organization," [3] residents of settlements were not always in sympathy with charity organization methods then prevailing. Their support in this instance was due, according to Robert Hunter, to the absolute necessity of having some organization of the charities of Chicago "because the settlements wished to free themselves from the pressure of relief work which was interfering with their own special activities." [4] Since then, in Chicago as elsewhere, there has been a growing recognition of the differentiation of the fields that the two movements

[1] Report of the Central Relief Association to the Civic Federation, to its Contributors and the Public, p. 5 (1894).

[2] The name "Bureau of Charities" was derived from the bureau of charities of the local Civic Federation which had played an active part in the organization of the above-mentioned Central Relief Association. The fostering of the new society by the Civic Federation had very considerable advantages in giving standing and consideration to its work, which must have come much more slowly had the movement been a separate and independent one. Merged in 1902 with the Chicago Relief and Aid Society, the charity organization society of the city has since been called the "United Charities."

[3] Quotation from Mr. Woods, see article by Robert W. deForest, "Twenty-five Years and After," *Charities and the Commons,* Vol. XIX, p. 1135 (1907).

[4] Robert Hunter, "Relation between Social Settlements and Charity Organization," *Journal of Political Economy,* Vol. XI, p. 76 (1902).

occupy, and with it has come a mutual recognition of the value of the work of each.

The program of the Bureau included the usual aims and objects of a charity organization society with an important addition for so large a city as Chicago, viz., "that for the first time the definite plan of friendly visiting was to be made a systematic part of so large a work." [1] This was in contrast to the work being done at the time in London and New York, cities of comparable size, in neither of which was emphasis placed on friendly visiting. In spite of high hopes, friendly visiting never played the rôle in the work of the Bureau that these founders had hoped.

The Citizens' Permanent Relief Committee in Philadelphia

Although a number of irresponsible relieving agencies sprang into existence during the first excitement of the depression, their careers were brief. The Citizens' Permanent Relief Committee, of which the Mayor was ex-officio chairman, organized to act for the citizens of Philadelphia in such catastrophies as the Charleston earthquake and the Johnstown flood, in response to a very general demand unanimously decided to lend its aid in the emergency. It added to its number representatives from several leading social agencies, including the Society for Organizing Charity. The committee then raised an emergency fund, the only one of importance in the city.

From the first, its work was surrounded by many of the safeguards essential to charity organization. The district system was adopted at the start and each district chairman was rigidly confined to his own boundaries; large visiting corps were organized and, after the first

[1] Anon., "Outlook in Chicago," *The Charities Review*, Vol. V, p. 295 (1896).

grant of relief, further aid was conditioned upon the favorable report of the visitor; and, whenever practicable, employment was given rather than relief without labor. All these features of the Committee's plan were advocated by the experienced charity workers with whom they took counsel. Thus with a special fund of less than $150,000, 13,000 families and 6,700 individuals were relieved, besides many thousands of men and women being furnished with work. It is interesting to note that, although in several cities with smaller populations than Philadelphia, the funds raised by subscription were much larger and were augmented by a lavish outpouring of municipal relief, there was no effort made to revive the old plan of municipal outdoor relief which had been abolished fourteen years earlier, largely through the efforts of the local Society for Organizing Charity.

The Relief Committee of the Commercial Club of Indianapolis

Some of the most efficient relief work of the winter of 1893-94 was undertaken in Indianapolis. A series of public meetings was held "of idle men whose express purpose was to attract public attention to the need, then rapidly becoming more and more distressing, of working people who had been out of employment for several months."[1] At one of these meetings a committee was appointed to appear before the directors of the Commercial Club of Indianapolis and a special committee of the Club was appointed as a result of this appeal. This committee submitted its report to the directors in November, "emphasizing the idea that relief should be given in a way that would enable recipients to earn it; that as a first step there should be an appeal to citizens to give employ-

[1] Report of Relief for the Unemployed in Indianapolis, 1893-94; quoted by E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," p. 420 (1904).

ment wherever they could, however little it might be. The methods suggested were:

I. Registration of unemployed.
II. Efforts to secure temporary employment for them through public contracts and such work as could be provided by citizens.
III. Leniency toward worthy persons known to be unable to meet their obligations for rent, to building associations, etc.
IV. Protection to home laborers from an influx of outside workingmen seeking employment.
V. The establishment, when it became necessary, of a place where substantial food could be bought at a nominal price.

The report was concurred in by the directors of the club, a public meeting of the unemployed and the Mayor." [1] It was generally believed that the local society alone could not handle the increasing demands that the depression had brought.[2] The special committee of the Commercial Club was accordingly continued as a permanent committee to carry out the above recommendations.

"At first it was announced," continues Dr. Devine in his account of the work of the committee, "that contributions for relief were not desired, and efforts were directed mainly to procuring employment. In the meantime, the committee representing the unemployed, chosen at one of their public meetings, had undertaken to provide relief until the permanent committee could take up the work. They were, however, asked to discontinue this

[1] E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," p. 420. For a more complete account of how Indianapolis met the relief problem of 1893-94, see "Principles of Relief," pp. 419-431, which is based on the Report of the Commercial Club Relief Committee, 1893-94.

[2] The report stated that the committee "found little foundation for any complaint or criticism" of the Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis. See Anon., "Charity Organization Societies," *The Charities Review*, Vol. III, p. 147 (1894).

when arrangements had been made by the permanent committee for the relief of destitution through the agency of the Charity Organization Society. The report of the committee says that 'in asking the society to temporarily take up this part of the work the committee desired that the ability of the organized agencies for the relief of distress should be tested before proceeding with other plans. The usual methods of charity work were not applied to the unemployed class who were referred to them.' All cases of need which were thereafter reported were looked after by the Charity Organization Society, which expended about $4,000 in such emergency relief. The committee pledged itself to reimburse the treasury of the society, so that it would not be without funds to carry on its usual charitable work during the remainder of the year. This enabled the committee to supply food where necessary, without making an immediate public appeal for that purpose. Any effort to raise funds by benefits on a percentage basis was discouraged." [1]

Registration on a systematic plan was soon begun and some 1,200 applicants for work were registered in the following three weeks. Temporary employment was provided by citizens and private contractors for about one-fifth of these applicants. This source of employment thus proved inadequate and had later to be supplemented by other means. Applicants to the Charity Organization Society who had not registered at the bureau were sent there to give some evidence of willingness to work before relief was given, and on the other hand, the committtee in charge of the employment bureau referred to the Society those who, in registering, stated that they were in immediate need.

A food market was opened the end of December, at which time the Charity Organization Society was supplying food to nearly a thousand families. The Society's available funds were then exhausted and those who had

[1] E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," p. 421 (1904).

been supplied with food were thereafter referred to the food market, the secretary of the Society certifying that, "according to the best obtainable information, they were residents of Indianapolis who belonged to the unemployed class, and were entitled to the credit offered to persons in need." Account books were issued to all applicants at the market. These contained "a copy of an agreement which the applicants were required to sign, pledging themselves to pay on demand such sums as might become due from them, or, whenever called upon to do so by the committee, to perform such work as might be required of them at 12½ cents per hour, to be applied to the payment of their indebtedness for supplies. This was to be the rate of pay for common labor only; if skilled work should be required, it was agreed that a special rate of pay would be allowed."[1] . . . "In the selection of the kinds of food supplied the committee sought to obtain the most wholesome and nutritious at the lowest cost. Wholesale dealers readily agreed, when called upon to sell to the committee at first cost, thus saving the committee a large sum of money. Purchasers were given the full benefit of this saving, the charge being almost exact cost rate, exclusive of expenses of administration."[2] . . . Arrangements were made to supply coal to those in need of fuel. Shoes were also supplied from the market, principally, however, old shoes collected by solicitors, who made a house-to-house canvass for this purpose.

"The expectation that the city might be able to provide employment on public work with compensation from the city treasury was not fulfilled. The committee finally offered to furnish the labor at its command for public work with the understanding that compensation would be made from the relief funds."[3] This was the plan followed, the work including street cleaning, excavation for

[1] E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," p. 423.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 425.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 426.

a lake in a public park and removing snow from street gutters.

At the end of the season the books of the market "showed an aggregate indebtedness of a comparatively small amount—less than $1,000, exclusive of the accounts with widows—from persons who had failed to perform the required work." The market was gradually closed during the month of March with the coöperation of the Charity Organization Society in taking over those who remained on the lists when the closing was finally effected.

A contemporaneous account of the winter's work in Indianapolis states, "An 'ample supply of food' is sent each week to dependent families, at a cost of about $1 a week for a family of four. The work is affirmed to be conducted 'in such a way that no person residing in Indianapolis need suffer for food.' At the same time the committee is prepared to deal vigorously with tramps and impostors, and no abnormal influx seems to have been brought about. The most noticeable feature in the measure adopted is the attempt to prevent by coöperation any duplication of assistance, imposition, and 'an untimely exhaustion of the charitable forces which it is necessary to conserve in every way possible, to enable the great burden to be borne throughout the time of need.' " [1]

The Indianapolis plan of giving wages, not in money but in supplies, was considered by many at the time an improvement over payment in money because the city of Indianapolis, buying at wholesale, could give more supplies in place of wages than the man employed could have bought if he had received the money. The wisdom of this plan was questioned by some in view of its possible demoralizing effect on self-respect.[2] Except for this possible criticism, the method of handling an extremely

[1] "Unemployed," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. XII, p. 132 (1894).
[2] Frederic Almy, "The Problem of Charity," *Charities Review,* Vol. IV, pp. 171-172 (1895).

difficult problem was unusually well met, and clearly demonstrated the wisdom of the methods of charity organization in so far as they could be applied to a situation, the main element of which was unemployment.

Irresponsible Emergency Agencies

The third general line of action used to meet the situation was characterized by emergency funds created under a management largely responsible to no one but their projectors. Citizens' committees and spontaneous charitable organizations, accountable to no one as to methods or finance, sprang up over night. Frequently, as in New York City, local newspapers who often exploited the distress of the poor for its advertising value, launched projects of one kind or another. Fortunate indeed was the community that was free from such mushroom enterprises. For unwise projects as well as for plans laid on better lines, the amount of money available was something unprecedented. Three million dollars were spent in so-called charity in New York City alone.[1]

Lessons of the Depression

The experiences of 1893-94 taught many valuable although expensive lessons in regard to the problems of relief, "for the sins then committed in the name of charity were many and serious." [2]

Foremost among these was the danger of large public funds in the hands of those inexperienced in problems of relief. Even in the hands of the experienced the tremendous congestion of work meant a lowering of standards. Hardly less important was the lesson that each community should have in reserve enough persons trained in relief work to be called upon in an emergency. Thou-

[1] Frederic Almy, "The Problem of Charity," *Charities Review*, Vol. IV, p. 170.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 170.

sands who rushed in to relieve the suffering in 1893-94 "had no time to stop and learn that charity is quite a different thing from alms." [1] As the Boston Society pointed out in reviewing its method of handling the situation, it is a mistake for a society not to have a supply of trained investigators and experienced volunteer visitors ready to be called upon in an emergency.

Another important lesson was the need of a definite effort to obtain the coöperation of the newspapers in all relief plans.[2] Either because of ignorance of charity organization methods or because of lack of sympathy with them on the part of the daily press, the charity organization society in more than one community had to a degree failed to have the popular ear. Instead the columns of the newspapers were given up during a large part of the winter to long accounts of suffering and exaggerated reports of sore distress. These were coupled with frantic appeals for the establishment of new agencies of aid and relief; little consideration being given to the adequacy of existing societies. It was generally felt after the days of emergency were over that while most of the increase in applicants for aid was due to the unprecedented hard times, "quite a considerable portion was ascribable to agitation." [3]

Another lesson learned was the mistake of launching in some communities enterprises semi-philanthropic in all but name, for the sale of groceries, coal, etc., at prices ruinous to petty dealers. They were not business enterprises, only a transparent simulation of business. One of their

[1] Frederic Almy, "The Problem of Charity," *Charities Review*, Vol. IV, p. 170 (1895).

[2] The secretary of one of the most progressive societies in the south stated that it was his custom to show unfailing courtesy and attention to any young "cub" that came to get news items from the Associated Charities. He felt it an invaluable opportunity to educate the possible future newspaper editor in the methods of modern charity. He stated that this policy had already gained for him excellent coöperation with a number of newspapers in the city.

[3] Wm. P. Fowler, "Emergency Work in Boston," *Lend-a-Hand*, Vol. XIII, p. 12 (1894).

pernicious effects was necessarily the driving out of business and into the ranks of the destitute of an unascertained number of small dealers, who could no longer sustain themselves against such rivalry. The very claim that these enterprises were not charitable, but business, gave the thrifty a saving pretext for using their restaurants and stores as bargain counters. "Doubtless the projectors of these schemes," wrote Charles D. Kellogg, "were sincere in their purpose and generous in their sentiments"; [1] but their methods were demonstrably erroneous.

In short, the outstanding lesson of the trying days of 1893-94 was the value of existing charity organization methods in times of unusual distress even when there was the need of more coöperation and more sinews of war. As pointed out by a contemporary, "wherever the work of relief was organized systematically, carefully and adequately, excellent results were attained; wherever it was done in a haphazard, indiscriminate manner" there was "a sad exhibition of funds wasted, imposture encouraged, deserving poverty neglected, and perhaps worst of all, the growth of permanent pauperism encouraged."[2]

To one who has studied the close connection between the industrial depression of the seventies and the birth of the charity organization movement, that the industrial depression of the nineties should have witnessed an unprecedented growth of new societies and a revival in places where earlier gains had been lost, as in Washington [3] and Chicago [4] is not surprising.

[1] Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 21st session, p. 29. (1894).

[2] Editorial, *The Monthly Register,* Vol. XVI, p. 1 (1894).

[3] Two years later (1895) the society underwent a thorough reorganization at the hands of the "progressives" who outvoted the older group in control and succeeded in calling from another city a new secretary. The big problem before the reorganized society for the succeeding five years which were a period of relaying foundations, was that of controlling unwise relief in the city. The society adopted a non-relief basis and decided against amalgamation with the recently incorporated relief society of the city but urged hearty coöperation.

[4] See pp. 224 and 256.

The Years 1883-1895 in Retrospect

That charity organization societies aimed to be agencies for *organizing* charity rather than relief societies is written all over the early history of the movement.[1] The fear inherited from the founders, of granting relief from their own funds, lest it metamorphose the new societies into relief agencies still obtained. This does not mean that there were not, before the period was over, societies which administered relief directly from their own funds. In fact, by 1895 there were only a bare majority of societies which maintained the principle of procuring relief exclusively from others. However, this bare numerical majority was, "a strong majority if greater weight be given to the leading societies and workers."[2] The attitude of the leaders of the movement was that where relief funds were held by charity organization societies, it was "a deplored necessity which must be reduced to a secondary incident of the work, or better still, entirely abolished." [3]

In other words, the organizing and educational aspects of the work of charity organization societies were of paramount importance. They asked money for the machinery of office, and protested that the ratio of their expenses to their relief disbursements was a false test of their work. They sent "hundreds of visitors and agents to the abodes of misery with empty purses, and pledged to withhold every penny of alms from their personal resources." [4]

Although there were many departures from the day's

[1] D. O. Kellogg, "The Function of Charity Organization," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. I, p. 452 (1886).

[2] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "The Charity Organization Movement," *Charities Review,* Vol. IV, p. 394 (1895).

[3] Charles D. Kellogg, Chairman, Committee on Charity Organization, Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 14th Session, p. 123 (1887).

[4] D. O. Kellogg, "The Function of Charity Organization," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. I, p. 452 (1886).

work among many societies, they nevertheless truly and repeatedly proclaimed that "they would not usurp the chosen duties of other agencies, but desired to maintain their independence and to enhance their usefulness." [1]

The Technique of the Early Days

One can not but be filled with admiration for the little band of leaders in the various communities where charity organization took root, who endeavored to hold aloft the new standards while seeking ever to improve the quality of their work.[2] While experience taught valuable lessons, there is no evidence of any real departure from the methods of case work first introduced by the pioneers.[3] Individualization of treatment was defined throughout the period, with remarkable insight. "If one of us," wrote the secretary of the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, "would do what can be done for our brother who is in distress, there is for us for the time but one class,—that which includes our brother, and there is in the universe but one representative of the class,—that is, himself." [4]

Likewise the concept of investigation, the first foundation stone of the new movement, was elucidated with remarkable insight. "Individualization," says the same worker, "calls for special diagnosis, keenest differentia-

[1] D. O. Kellogg, "The Function of Charity Organization," *Lend-a-Hand*, Vol. I, p. 452 (1886).

[2] Mr. Alexander Johnson, who may justly be called the father of the Section Meetings of the National Conference of Social Work, stated to the author that in the early days the leaders of the movement were "so hungry to get something out of each other" that they would often hold meetings at 8 o'clock in the morning before the regular sessions. Sometimes a busy executive, at considerable trouble, would take time to spend a week in another city for the purpose of studying the working of the local society at close range.

[3] The contributions to good case work did not all come from those in the ranks of charity organization. For example, in Boston, Mr. Charles Birtwell, then of the Children's Aid Society, was developing independently and coöperatively with the Associated Charities, better standards of case work than had previously obtained.

[4] George B. Buzelle, "Individuality in the Work of Charity," *The Monthly Register*, Vol. VIII, p. 16 (1886).

tion of features, and most intense concentration of thought and effort,"[1] while another adds that if investigations are thorough, one must know not only that a person is in distress but "how they got into that condition."[2] One can not expect to do much for others unless one *knows* them and realizes that "they are men and women and have some of the same feelings and duties as the men and women"[3] of other walks of life. It was pointed out repeatedly that a sound understanding of the situation should precede treatment.

In spite of the ideals thus voiced by the leaders, and in spite of the practice of some of the best equipped societies, the investigations made by some of the charity organization societies at the time of which we write, as revealed on the old record cards, seem crude in the light of present-day practice.[4] The quality of work of the different societies then as since differed greatly. The name charity organization has never been preëmpted. It is quite within truth to say that investigation of the kind which not only determines what help should be given, but also reveals from what sources such help should come, and how agencies may be brought into definite and hearty coöperation in carrying out the necessary treatment, is something whose full possibilities were not grasped by the majority of charity organization societies of the period under review. Probably "two-thirds of the errors in charity work," wrote an active worker of the eighties, "are from misinformation or lack of information."[5] Occasionally one finds a charity organization society which either

[1] George B. Buzelle, "Individuality in the Work of Charity," *The Monthly Register,* Vol. VIII, p. 16 (1886).
[2] Alexander Johnson, "Familiar Letters on Charity Organization," *The Monthly Register,* Vol. VII, p. 26 (1887).
[3] Josephine Shaw Lowell, Letter to Editor of *The Monthly Register,* Vol. VIII, p. 27 (1887).
[4] Mary E. Richmond, "What is Charity Organization?" *Charities Review,* Vol. IX, p. 496 (1900).
[5] Zilpha D. Smith, "The Organization of Charity," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 15th session, p. 127 (1888).

acted as an investigator for other social agencies or offered its services as such, failing to realize that diagnosis and treatment go hand in hand, the latter in practice being a part of the former. More frequently one finds evidences of the work test being used as a substitute for investigation, a practice long since discredited.

Although charity organization societies in the main shaped themselves to the existing social agencies of their respective communities, and "asked not for their forbearance, but their coöperation," [1] "a thoroughly scientific coöperation"[2] of all charitable agencies, public and private, was still hardly more than a name. Efficient coöperation with relieving agencies was usually most difficult. In some cities it dwindled to almost nothing, although in others a fair measure of coöperation obtained as in Boston or even public outdoor relief officials cooperated fully, as in Buffalo.[3] Even when coöperation was more than nominal, "too often," wrote one of the leaders of the movement, "we lose sight of this, our cardinal principle, and feel in actual field work strongly tempted to deal with individual cases upon our own responsibility." [4] The various social agencies were not "touching elbows" then as now.[5]

It is not, therefore, surprising that when charity organization societies asked all interested in the relief of the needy to send to their Registration Bureaus a history of the families that they were helping with the respective

[1] D. O. Kellogg, "The Functions of Charity Organization," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. I, p. 452 (1886).

[2] Robert Treat Paine, Jr., Discussion, Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 8th session, p. 119 (1881).

[3] Amos G. Warner, "American Charities," p. 446 (1894).

[4] Alexander Johnson, "Coöperation in the Work of Charity," *The Charities Review,* Vol. II, p. 21 (1892).

[5] From a personal interview with Mr. George S. Wilson, one time General Secretary of the Associated Charities of Washington, D. C.

See also John M. Glenn, "The Need of Organization in Charity Work," *Charities,* Vol. III, p. 5 (1899).

amounts of relief given, their requests often fell on deaf or unsympathetic ears. Many agencies either failing to see the value in such a clearing-house of information [1] or taking the stand that the information contained in their records was confidential, refused to register their cases. In the great city of Chicago the local Bureau of Charities as late as 1900 was still unearthing the stupid condition of "a half dozen agencies helping one family." [2]

The failure in getting anything like a general use of the principle of the registration of cases inevitably rendered difficult if not impossible the best type of case work. The registration bureau, though only a tool, was nevertheless the *sine qua non* of the best work.

In reviewing the quality of work of charity organization societies previous to 1896, it must also be borne in mind that family social workers then did not have as many social resources ready at hand as now. The social equipment in 1890 of a city the size of Baltimore is illustrative. "There was no Instructive Visting Nurse Association; no Babies' Milk Fund Society; no Association for the Prevention and Relief of Tuberculosis; no state or private war of any sort on tuberculosis; no hospital social service work; no Playground Association, or Public Athletic League, or Boy Scouts. Fresh-air work was in its infancy. There was no Juvenile Court; no Social Hygiene Committee, or . . . Mental Hygiene Committee." [3] It must be said to their credit, however, that the leaders constantly emphasized "promptness and adequacy" in treatment. Workers were admonished to help "in such a way that the condition shall not return as

[1] "This clearing-house function of the Charity Organization Society is the first and perhaps most fundamental one, and the one most clearly stated in the name which the societies adopted." Amos G. Warner, "American Charities," p. 382 (1894).

[2] See Report of Chicago Bureau of Charities, p. 4, issued jointly for 1899-1900 and 1900-1901.

[3] Kate M. McLane, "Baltimore 1890-1915, A Retrospect and a Comparison," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 88 (1915).

soon as the aid bestowed" is "consumed."[1] The ideal held high was that of seeing a case through, of seeing that difficulties should not only be remedied but stay remedied.

In much of their work the real problem was viewed "in the broad sense, as spiritual not physical, and solvable only through spiritual agencies."[2] It was held that there was enough money already available if only systematically managed, for the material relief required.[3] What was needed and hard to get for the "destitute and ignorant" were "personal kindnesses, even the alms of understanding, prudence, discretion, counsel, friendship."[4]

The disapproval of material relief in the form of doles and alms-giving explains in large measure the continued hostility of the charity organization forces in several places to public outdoor relief. It was held, in the words of Josephine Shaw Lowell, "the larger the funds given in relief in any community, the more pressing is the demand for them."[5] The Buffalo Society, for example, conducted a successful campaign to reduce the amount of the public outdoor relief of the city, while the Organized Charity Association of New Haven in a vigorous way called the attention of its town officials to the waste of money then permitted in outdoor relief. "Of the 1,188 persons regularly aided, an investigation showed that only 380 were proper recipients of relief."[6]

Although friendly visiting was viewed during the years here reviewed as one of the "spiritual agencies" of family case work, whose value was unquestioned, it was never-

[1] Alexander Johnson, "Familiar Letters on Charity Organization," *The Monthly Register,* Vol. VII, p. 26 (1887)

[2] George B. Buzelle, "Charity Organization in Cities," *The Charities Review,* Vol. II, p. 8 (1892).

[3] Charles D. Kellogg, "Charity Organization as an Educative Force," *The Charities Review,* Vol. II, p. 19 (1892).

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 19.

[5] See C. K. Meredith, "Charity Organization and the Church," *The Monthly Register,* Vol. VII, p. 38 (1886).

[6] *Charities Review,* Vol. X, p. 150 (1900).

theless admitted to be the "weak point of the charity organization society" [1] in most places.[2] The Buffalo Society, the oldest large society in the country, had but few friendly visitors before launching its church district plan. By 1895, in one city with a population of nearly 300,000, a society thirteen years old had none, while in another city with a population of over 200,000 a society eleven years old had given up this form of volunteer work after five years' trial. The New York Society, located in the largest city in the land had but few visitors.[4] Moreover, the majority of visitors throughout the country seemed to feel that their only duty was "to see their families through some immediate need." [5]

In marked contrast was the relative success of friendly visiting in both Boston and Baltimore. Historically, the Boston Society grew out of friendly visiting.[6] From its beginning it had made conscious efforts to build up a large corps of friendly visitors. By the close of the eighties it could claim approximately a thousand visitors in service. By 1892 a definite plan for the education of friendly visitors and for maintaining their interest in the work of the Society had been worked out.[7] The Baltimore Society was greatly influenced by the success of the Boston Society. As a result, after repeated trials and failures at friendly visiting, it could claim by 1895 an unpadded list of over four hundred visitors.

[1] John M. Glenn, "Problems of Charity Organization Workers," *Charities Review,* Vol. VIII, p. 514 (1899).

[2] See the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Associated Charities of Washington, D. C., p. 26 (1897); also "News of Local Charities," *Charities,* Vol. I, p. 8 (1897).

[3] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "The Charity Organization Movement," *Charities Review,* Vol. IV, p. 395 (1895).

[4] Mrs. E. C. Bolles, "Would Personal Influence Diminish Pauperism?" *The Charities Review,* Vol. II, p. 416 (1892).

[5] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "The Charity Organization Movement," *Charities Review,* Vol. IV, p. 395 (1895).

[6] See p. 178.

[7] Copies of a paper describing this work were sent at the time to all the Charity Organization Societies in the country. Zilpha D. Smith, "The Education of the Friendly Visitor," *Charities Review,* Vol. II, p. 51 (1892).

Failure to work out definite plans for training friendly visitors and maintaining their interest explains in large measure the relatively poor success most societies had in this part of their work. However, there were extenuating circumstances in some instances. The relative size of the territory covered by a society was a factor for or against success. In some cities, as Chicago, which covers so vast a territory, the mere problem of transportation from one part of the city to another constituted a serious obstacle. This was sometimes further complicated by the development of so-called "slum" districts, separating the rich and poor by great distances, as in New York and Chicago. Such a separation proved a barrier, though not insurmountable, to the development of true neighborliness. As great a barrier was also found in frequent differences of race, especially if accompanied by those of religion and language.

It should not be inferred from anything just stated that the methods of charity organization did not gain an increasing number of advocates and followers wherever tried during the period just surveyed. When wholeheartedly applied in the trying days of 1893-94, charity organization methods stood the test. Nevertheless, as contrasted with the last fifteen years, there was a relative lack of advance in the refinement of the technique of family case work and a frequently wide divergence between principle and practice.

This seems to have been due in part to the many extra activities which a number of societies with the best of motives added on to their immediate task of doing the best piece of case work possible for their clients. Often these obligations were assumed because no one else seemed available to render the service. Nevertheless, "while much was accomplished in various places, there seems to be little doubt," writes a contemporary observer, "that in some instances these measures proved to be profitless experiments. At any rate, they were abandoned. In

other instances they metamorphosed the society and withdrew it from the charity organization ranks."[1] Although not having such unfortunate results, the general secretary of the Buffalo Society found that the direction of these extra activities required perhaps the larger part of his time. There seems to be evidence that this was to the detriment of the quality of its family case work.

There were extenuating circumstances to explain the relatively slow gain in the general acceptance of charity organization methods. It required strong persuasion and weighty argument to get the larger communities, not to mention the smaller, to see that organization applies to charity as to business, if it is to be efficient. Charity organization came as a reform and reforms are never popular at first. People do not change suddenly their whole theory with regard to poverty and its relief. Only where there are common convictions can there be any vital coöperation, and for a long time the charity organizationists of the earlier days had to spend their zeal and strength in the task of converting the unbeliever.

The period under review antedates the day of training schools of social work and special research departments for the study of the technique of social case work. Workers were so few that, short-sighted as it may have been, these other things had to wait. As a result the movement lacked an adequate number of trained workers. As the leaders had no others to turn to many recruits in the ranks were perfectly green.

Although the movement had everywhere an uphill fight, its greatest struggles were in the smaller towns, where it more frequently proved difficult to discover suitable men for the secretaryship of the local society. This problem was all the more serious, as charity organization was still on trial in the smaller communities and had

[1] D. O. Kellogg, "The Function of Charity Organization," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. I, p. 453 (1886).

therefore to produce more tangible results and meet more objections than in those larger cities where its need and value were more easily seen.[1]

To attempt to voice the social philosophy of a generation that is gone is a perilous task. Although various societies had exercised from the beginning a definite influence on legislation affecting the welfare of their respective communities and here and there had fostered preventive efforts, their work as contrasted with what is known to-day in the language of current social work, as "preventive and social" [2] was, in the main, remedial and individual. There is ample evidence, however, that it was cure and not mere alleviation that they sought. In doing so, the supreme object continued to be that of the founders in England and America, namely, the conservation of character, or when lost, its reclamation. "The greatest wrong" that can be done to a poor man, writes Mrs. Lowell, is "to undermine" his "character," "for it is his all. The struggle is hard· he needs all his determination and strength of will to fight his way, and nothing that deprives him of these qualities can be 'charitable.' " [3]

Individual work, by individuals with individuals, was held to be the only effective way of helping. The problem in the final analysis is always "an individual, personal problem." Its solution, writes another worker, "rests with myself and my neighbor," [4] for "it is only individuals who can influence individuals." [5]

[1] Anna L. Dawes, "The Need of Training Schools for a New Profession," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. XI, p. 91 (1893).

Even so late as 1905, Alexander Johnson, writing on Organization in the Smaller Cities, said, "Organized charity has hitherto been most successful in the great cities." *Charities,* Vol. XIV, p. 711 (1905).

[2] Robert W. deForest, "The Broadening Sphere of Organized Charity," Published by the Field Department of the Charities Publication Committee.

[3] See C. K. Meredith, "Charity Organization and the Church," *The Monthly Register,* Vol. VII, p. 38 (1886).

[4] George B. Buzelle, "Charity Organization, Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, p. 211 (1892).

[5] Robert W. deForest, "The Broadening Sphere of Organized Charity," published by the Field Department of the Charities Publication Committee, p. 3.

In short, the main emphasis of the movement during its youth was laid upon helping the individual direct. In doing so there was a revulsion against indiscriminate almsgiving, the emphasis being laid on aid through personal service, an insistence upon ascertainment of fact before action, and upon action being directed toward a *permanent* change in the condition of the individual or family. "Permanent self-dependence of the individual or family, or if age or disability made self-dependence impossible, then permanent support somewhere and from some source, were the ends which it sought to attain. And in attaining these ends it used the friendly visitor in preference to any mere dole giver, and sought to combine and coördinate resources of the community." [1]

That cure by the case-by-case method rather than "mass" movements for prevention characterized these early days seems to have been due to several causes. Often the various societies were not far enough along in their search for causes to be sure enough to launch a movement whose end was prevention. Again the community as a whole was not ripe for it. By the method of case work, charity organization societies had first to develop a community ready to support preventive movements. The tasks before the various societies were so pressing and the laborers, relatively speaking, so few, that the relief of distress, being more immediate, took precedence over measures exclusively preventive. Also there was lacking medical and social knowledge on the basis of which alone some of the reforms since attempted could have been started.

That it was realized by some that "poverty and crime are both the results of social conditions, often deeply rooted in the soil left by the decay and corruption of other generations; conditions which in themselves need reform," [2] is amply illustrated by a number of annual

[1] Robert W. deForest, "The Broadening Sphere of Organized Charity," published by the Field Department of the Charities Publication Committee, p. 3.

[2] Editor, *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. I, p. 702 (1886).

reports of charity organization societies, issued the latter half of the period just surveyed, and by the following paragraphs from an address which is quoted at some length, as it was given wide publicity in charity organization circles at the time: [1]

"Where the Old Charity gave a shilling and lost sight of them [the poor], the New follows them, and sees where they sleep and eat, are born and die. It tries by every effort and resource at its command to reconstruct their surroundings. It appeals at once to the self-respect of the tenant and to the humanity of the owner; it invokes the aid of the law; it shows the capitalist that a sage investment may consist with the bestowing of the greatest blessings on the poor.

"Pursuing its quest for the causes of poverty outside of the poor, it finds itself confronted with the relations of employer and employed. At the head of its alphabet, come the letters which spell the word JUSTICE. And by justice it does not mean merely paying the wages which the employed have agreed to receive. While it says to the one class, 'If any man will not work, neither shall he eat,' to the other class it says in language no less explicit, 'Employers, give unto your employed that which is just and equal.' This giving of what is just and equal would do away very largely with the need of what we call charity. It is not the ideal of the New Charity that the employer should cut the laborer down below a living wage, and then give him a turkey at Christmas.

"While it says to all men, 'In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat thy bread,' it also says to all men, 'As every man has received a gift, whether it be of genius, of wealth, of social position, of influence, even so minister the same one to another, all your fellows in humanity, as faithful trustees of the manifold gift of God.'

"The New Charity goes to great employers, to the Presidents of gigantic Railroad Corporations, and it says:

[1] Rev. H. L. Wayland, "The Old Charity and the New," an address delivered at the annual meeting of the New York Charity Organization Society in February, 1886. It was afterward reprinted in *The Monthly Register,* Vol. VII, No. 4, p. 30, and also in *The Reporter.* The Rev. Wayland was the founder of the New Haven Society.

'While we realize your personal kindness of heart, while we value your private almsgiving, yet we feel that the greatest work that you can do for your tens of thousands of employed lies in giving them an equity that is according to the Law of Sinai and the Mountain Sermon, by extending to them moral reinforcement, by encouraging and helping them to save, to become in a small way capitalists, partners in your enterprise, sharers in your success.' "

In much the same vein, the president of the Boston Associated Charities asked, "has not the new charity organization movement too long been content to aim at a system to relieve or even uplift judiciously single cases without asking if there are not prolific causes permanently at work to create want, vice, crime, disease and death; and whether these causes may not be wholly or in a large degree eradicated? If such causes of pauperism exist, how vain to waste our energies on single cases of relief, when society should rather aim at removing the prolific sources of all the woe."[1] After stating his belief that the problem of poor relief in great cities should be "restated in ampler terms," he adds, in no uncertain words, "The diseases of society are more aggravated, the dangers are graver, the need of radical remedies is more absolute than the new charity has yet fully and fairly faced."[2] In harmony with this point of view he declares elsewhere that there were 8,000 souls living in Boston "in homes that should be destroyed as unfit for human habitation."[3]

In the closing years of the period, the chairman of the Charity Organization Committee of the National Con-

[1] Robert Treat Paine, Jr., "Pauperism in Great Cities: Its Four Chief Causes," Proceedings, International Congress of Charities, Correction and Philanthropy, Vol. I, p. 35 (1893).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[3] Robert Treat Paine, Jr., "Emergency Loans," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. XI, p. 426 (1893).

ference of Charities and Correction, after stating his belief that it was the duty of charity organizationists to educate public opinion to ideas of true benevolence and that each individual helped up and on, was a means to this end, expressed his belief that the critics of charity organization societies were often just in saying that while such societies were busy over little things, they often omitted matters of great weight, and that "charity organization societies must work harder to do away with the causes of poverty and pauperism or they will be weighed in the balance and found wanting." [1] "Are we moving a few individuals to healthy homes," he asked, "and yet leaving without protest perhaps, the unfit houses for others to occupy? . . . I do not believe that we are doing all we can, by our influence as societies and as individuals, to abolish all conditions which depress, and to promote measures which raise men and neighborhoods and communities. . . ."[2]

Thus as we have seen the experiment in charity organization, ushered in less than two decades earlier in a modest and tentative spirit, had been tried, and tried with heavy odds against it, especially in the difficult years of 1893-94. While far from perfect, it had been found to answer its purpose. The methods of charity organization had been equal to the strain of actual service. The means, facilities and expedients devised generally and adopted were those which subsequent use has shown to be helpful to the worker. The general methods accepted, although destined to be enriched greatly by subsequent experience and scientific research, had proven sound and to contain vital ideas. To say this does not imply that at this time nor at any time since, have family social workers felt that the last word has been said about the

[1] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "The Charity Organization Movement: Its Tendency and Its Duty," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 22nd session, p. 86 (1895).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

methods of efficient social case work. These methods when honestly applied by those of an inquiring mind also naturally led on to the many preventive measures which, as we shall presently see, characterize the next period of development.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ERA OF MOVEMENTS FOR THE PREVENTION OF POVERTY

[1896-1904]

The number of societies in the country using charity organization methods at the close of the period here reviewed was approximately one hundred and fifty,[1] as contrasted with approximately one hundred for the close of the period preceding. Although societies existed in all sections of the country, the vast majority were still to be found east of the Mississippi and north of the Mason and Dixon line. Most of them were also still located in the relatively larger centers of population. Charity organization societies were to be found in over fifty of the sixty odd cities in the country having 60,000 population or over. The smaller towns and semi-rural districts were in the main untouched by the movement. Thus no less than thirty-six towns in Ohio, most of which had populations of less than 10,000, and but three over 20,000, had no organization for the care of the poor except the public relief system.[2] This, however, is not so surprising when "the very general absence of any serious need of relief in any form except that of relatives and friends" was believed to characterize the situation in such communities.[3]

[1] This includes some relief societies which had transformed their methods to harmonize with charity organization principles.

[2] Anon., "Organized Charities in Small Cities," *Charities Review,* Vol. X, p. 394 (1900).

[3] See Edward T. Devine, "Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes," *Charities Review,* Vol. X, p. 120 (1900).

The standards of work of the different societies as might be expected varied greatly. Charity organization is not automatic. Its success means earnest, intelligent, discriminate work, persistently carried on; it means that the community which wishes to succeed in helping people out of their poverty must put brains, capacity and money into the work.

Some of the existing organizations were charity organization societies in name only. Among others there often existed "an incompatibility of method."[1] Conditions in Ohio as revealed by a current investigation are apparently typical and illustrative. In but five cities of the state was the local work organized on modern lines and the respective societies not improperly called charity organization societies. Societies in seven other communities bearing the name were simply relief societies, credited with doing "a good many other things that nobody ought to do."[2]

The situation in some of the larger cities with charity organization societies of long standing was far from healthy. It was but five years earlier that the Associated Charities of Washington, D. C., had faced a crisis from which it was able to emerge with any degree of vitality only because of radical reorganization [3] and a change of policy. The Associated Charities of Minneapolis, launched in 1884, found itself struggling in 1898 "to keep things going and meet anywhere near decently the demands for help made upon the organization." [4] Its annual

[1] Frank Tucker, "The Report of the Committee on the Care and Relief of Needy Families in their Homes," *Charities,* Vol. VII (1901).

[2] Anon., "Organized Charities in Small Cities," *Charities Review,* Vol. X, p. 394 (1900).

[3] Even to-day not a little of the work of the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work is devoted to reorganizing or strengthening societies.

[4] "A Quarter Century of Work Among the Poor," 1884-1909, including the Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Associated Charities of Minneapolis, p. 23 (1909).

income had decreased over 100% since 1894. The society in Omaha was entirely inactive between 1900 and 1902. Most of the developments which to-day characterize societies in both Cleveland and Chicago saw their rise since 1900. Other instances might be cited to show that there was "little or no consistency in the practices of the various large charity organization societies and associated charities of the country," [1] and that in some places, as in Philadelphia, the movement had lost a grip on the situation. By 1901 the relations among the charities of Philadelphia amounted to an "armed neutrality," and there was a possibility that the local charity organization society would disband instead of attempting reorganization, which latter course was finally decided upon. There were about twenty-four hundred separate agencies in the city. To complicate the situation further, eleven soup houses, some of them dating back for a century, were feeding annually approximately 80,000 persons and spending $25,000.[2] The city was, moreover, competing with Chicago as to which sheltered the larger number of vagrants. Forty thousand lodgings were supplied in the police stations of Philadelphia in 1900. No one was refused shelter who requested it. If the lodger became habitual, the magistrate was asked to commit him to the House of Correction. During the severe weather some of the stations were so crowded that the cell rooms were used to accommodate the overflow.

The lamentable position in the community of the Philadelphia Society appears to have been in the main the logical outcome of a blind adherence to the so-called "Philadelphia Plan" [3] of organizing charity, after that

[1] Frank Tucker, "What a Charity Worker Is Expected to Do," *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 35 (1901).

[2] A house-to-house canvass of the district of one of these soup houses made at the time revealed the fact that the soup-dispensing system was a "wanton waste of well-intended but mistaken philanthropy." See Anon., *Charities*, Vol. IV, No. 20, p. 10 (1900).

[3] See p. 190.

plan no longer suited the condition of the city. Under the earlier conditions a system of district committees had not the dangers and weaknesses [1] of such a system twenty years later, when, with the advent of rapid transit and the influx of immigrants, slums and ghettos developed on one hand, and exclusive residential districts on the other. Although this decentralized system of local committees had been abandoned in other American cities, it was still adhered to in Philadelphia up to the time under review.[2] The Central Board had effective control of but three wards out of the city's forty-two. While the system of independent districts had been very successful in some parts of the city, wards containing more than nine-tenths of the population of the city needed reorganization to bring their work up to standard. The need of a strong central body having the confidence of the community and prepared to set a standard of work below which no district should be permitted to drop was apparent. The Central Board faced a difficult problem, as only those wards were willing to reorganize which had empty treasuries. In spite of the difficulties, as we shall see, this was practically accomplished by 1906,[3] the year when, by the persistent and hearty coöperation of the leaders of some of Philadelphia's social agencies, the National Conference of Charities and Correction was brought to that city.

The lack of coöperation among local social agencies

[1] "There is no gainsaying the fact that even the strongest and best district organizations suffer and fall short of rendering their full public service if there is not also an energetic and efficient central organization standing conspicuously for the principles of adequate relief, coöperation among workers, personal service on behalf of those who are in need, and determined, unremitting warfare against the social conditions which create pauperism." Anon., *Charities,* Vol. V, No. 25, p. 8 (1900).

[2] It was not until 1900 that the Chicago Bureau of Charities centralized its financial system. Instead of having a treasurer in each of its eleven districts and a separate collection of the funds necessary for its support from the residents of the district, financial matters were entrusted to a central committee of fifteen and a central treasurer. Anon., *Charities,* Vol. V, No. 27, pp. 15, 16 (1900).

[3] At this writing (1921) there is but one district committee outside the control and supervision of the Central Board.

was unfortunately not limited to Philadelphia.[1] This often led to the launching in many communities of mushroom social agencies resulting in a loss of money, time and good temper. The death of fifty-five per cent of all the charities established in Baltimore during the first four years of the period under review is illustrative. As late as the opening of the present century, registration bureaus or social service exchanges, as now more generally called, had been given a fair trial in but two or three cities.[2]

Although the Boston Society's experience of twenty years with friendly visiting had proven it more than an experiment, the societies with anything like adequate corps of friendly visitors were the striking exceptions. There were apparently no societies in the country with district offices except some on the Atlantic coast and Buffalo and Chicago. One of the reasons for the lack of standardization just noted was no doubt, as Mrs. Bosanquet pointed out at the time, the scarcity of trained workers. The idea that training is "a necessary preliminary to charitable work" was essentially new.[3] A further reason was the meagreness of literature on the technique of social case work. Everybody had been doing relief work, but no one was "able apparently to formulate any very helpful suggestions as to how it should be done." [4]

Although a number of communities had a long way to travel before the methods of charity organization were generally and consistently followed, it would create too dark a picture to omit any reference to the substantial progress that those principles and methods had made. For example, when in many cities and towns in the blizzard of 1899 "a spirit of blind abandon shoveled out

[1] Samuel H. Bishop, "A New Movement in Charity," *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 446 (1901).

[2] Mary E. Richmond, "What is Charity Organization?" *Charities Review*, Vol. IX. p. 497 (1900).

[3] Helen Bosanquet, "Methods of Training," *Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 389 (1900).

[4] Mary E. Richmond, "What is Charity Organization?" *Charities Review*, IX, p. 493 (1900).

relief by the wagon load,"[1] not a few cities, notably the larger ones, turned to the established charitable agencies and entrusted to them the work of relief. Newspapers which a decade earlier would have loaded wagons with supplies and dispensed them on street corners, joined in supporting the work of established organizations. The Mayor of Chicago did issue a public appeal for relief for alleged great destitution, stating that funds sent him would be distributed through the police. The appeal, however, met with little public response and much criticism on the part of the officials of the city's outdoor relief and of several prominent social agencies. In Baltimore the A. I. C. P. and C. O. S. took a leading part in meeting the emergency, although but a few years earlier "it would have been considered in Baltimore a strange thing to give emergency relief money to charity societies instead of to the police."[2] In New York City a special committee inaugurated by the C. O. S. undertook to give relief by employing men at $1.00 a day to help the city department clear the streets of the East Side of snow, which for several days completely blocked the work of removing garbage. Although in many cases charity organization societies were led to methods of relief which were doubtless against their best judgment, nevertheless the societies seem in general to have met the situation adequately or at least in a fashion that showed they had gained in confidence and ability since the trying days of '93.[3] In short, during the period under review, the so-called principles of charity organization were increasingly adhered to and even avowed critics of the movement seem to have paid charity organizationists a tribute for their relative thoroughness of methods.[4]

[1] Anon., "Poverty in the Storm," *Charities Review,* Vol. IX, pp. 3-4 (1899).

[2] *Ibid.,* pp. 1-2.

[3] *Ibid.,* pp. 3-4.

[4] It was pointed out at the National Conference of Charities and Correction in 1899 that charity organization societies had been able to formulate "such a statement of their fundamental principles and to

The Early Interest in Housing Conditions

No one can work with people in want without perceiving that bad housing is one of the direct causes of poverty. As early as 1797, as was noted in an earlier chapter,[1] a special supervisor was appointed under the Hamburg plan to secure as far as possible improved dwellings "for the poor." The work of Miss Octavia Hill in London in behalf of better housing for the poor and the interest of men of the time like Edward Denison is too well known to need further mention here. In America the importance of sanitary housing was early borne in upon the pioneers. Of charity organization societies the Buffalo Society was among the first to stress the importance of housing. As early as 1883 it had pointed out "that a permanent improvement in the condition of the poor can only be accomplished by a betterment of their surroundings."[2] In 1891 this society had secured an ordinance from the city regulating tenement houses which marked a step forward. In the fall of 1892, anticipating cholera in Buffalo, its agents had been detailed by the city Board of Health to inspect tenement houses. As an outcome of this inspection the city took steps governing the erection and care of tenement and lodging houses, passing ordinances on the subject, drafted by the Society's Committee on Sanitary Condition of the Homes of the Poor, in coöperation with the Board of Health and Superintendent of Buildings. The enforcement of these and subsequent ordinances has remained an ever-present problem of the society. Mention has already

give such reasons for the division of work between others and themselves as to disarm prejudice and to make the principles and explanations appear rational, charitable, sympathetic and Christian." See Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 26th session, p. 275 (1899). See also Homer Folks, "The Care of Needy Families in Their Homes," *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 414 (1901).

[1] See p. 26.

[2] Proceedings, Fifth Annual Meeting, C. O. S. of Buffalo, p. 31 (1883).

been made of the work in the field of housing reform of Alfred T. White of the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities. Under his inspiration a model tenement, the first of its kind, was erected in Brooklyn. It gave impulse to a great popular wave of interest in the reduction of the evils of tenement house life which in turn led to the passage in 1879 of a tenement house law in New York. Though imperfect, it marked advance over the law of 1867, the first in the country to attempt to regulate tenements. Reference should also be made to the fact that in the late eighties one of the district conferences of the Boston Associated Charities had made under the direction of Professor Dwight Porter, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and with the coöperation of the Board of Health, "one of the best and most fruitful investigations" of certain tenement-house districts of Boston that had ever been made.[1] It resulted in important changes in the existing law on the subject.

By the opening of the period of history covered by this chapter definite improvements in tenement and sanitary conditions had been brought about in no less than ten cities, largely through the efforts of the local charity organization society.

A New Epoch in Housing Reform

Housing reform on a large scale seems to progress in waves or in rhythms. It is not possible to maintain a public agitation over one social ill, no matter how bad, without interruption. The tension necessary for social action must occasionally be relaxed. The time seemed ripe about the beginning of the new century for a housing movement of unprecedented proportions. We are here, however, concerned only with the contribution which the charity organization movement had to make. Early in the period under review, Mr. Lawrence Veiller, at one

[1] Anon., *Charities,* Vol. VII, p. 52 (1901).

time a resident in a settlement in New York City, believing that the most serious question affecting the welfare of the working people of that city was the matter of housing, sought to form an Improved Housing Association to investigate conditions and to carry through necessary reforms in that field.[1] The then general secretary of the Charity Organization Society of New York City dissuaded him from organizing a separate association. Instead, the New York Society instituted a special committee on tenement house reform, with Mr. Veiller as secretary, "to consider the revision of the building laws so far as such revision affect the laws relating to tenement and lodging houses." [2] Having failed in an attempt to secure suitable legislation from the local legislative body, the committee prepared an extensive exhibition showing in picturesque and graphic form the existing tenement house conditions. The educational effect of the exhibition was not limited to New York City, but extended throughout the State and even beyond. Largely through the efforts of the Society's Committee on Tenement House Reform, the Governor of the State subsequently appointed a commission on which were two members from the central council of the Charity Organization Society,[3] to investigate the tenement house problem in cities of the first class. All of the recommendations of the commission were embodied in the laws. These measures prescribed the conditions under which tenement houses could be built in the future, the alterations required in existing buildings to make them habitable and decent, and the character of official inspections of old and new houses. The new laws did away with the

[1] The field in New York City had been plowed by the work of the Tenement House Committee of 1894, of which Richard Watson Gilder was chairman.

[2] Robert Hunter, "Relation between Social Settlements and Charity Organization," *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. XI, pp. 86, 87 (1902).

[3] Mr. Robert W. de Forest, president of the society, became Chairman of the Commission. Mr. Lawrence Veiller served as secretary of the Commission.

dark, narrow and unventilated airshaft, which had been the especial abomination of the ordinary New York tenement house,[1] and secured many minor but essential reforms. They also provided for the creation of a new department responsible for the enforcement of the tenement-house laws in New York City.

The social consequences of such a piece of legislation are more readily appreciated when it is recalled that at the time of the organization of this new department more than two-thirds of the entire population of New York City were living in approximately 83,000 tenement houses.

The Committee on Tenement House Reform, which had initiated this reform movement, and had given way temporarily to the State Commission, was then reorganized as a permanent committee of the society. By 1913, as one result of tenement house laws secured largely through the activities of the Committee, windows had been cut into 200,000 dark rooms; running water was to be found on each floor of every tenement house; over a million and a half people were living in homes with outside light and air in every room, a sink, running water, and a private water-closet in every apartment; and two-thirds of these with their own private bath. In 1914, in coöperation with the Tenement House Department of the city of New York, it inaugurated a campaign to educate tenement house dwellers in making their homes more comfortable and sanitary. Under the approval of the Mayor an educational pamphlet was issued jointly by the Tenement House Department and the Tenement House Committee of the C. O. S., to be distributed to every family of tenement dwellers in the city, to be followed by a visit from a woman inspector of the Tenement House Department to the mother of

[1] See Jacob Riis, "How the Other Half Lives" (1894). The publication of this book created an epoch in the history of tenement house and other anti-slum agitation.

every family to explain why the book was issued, to point out how its suggestions, if followed, would help her and her family. Although the pamphlet, which advised against renting dark rooms, and gave a list of things against which the tenant has a legal right to complain, was intended primarily to benefit the tenant, it at the same time aided the landlord, in that it covered the duties of tenants as well as their rights.

The Tenement House Committee of the local society has ever since taken an active part in the enforcement of the tenement house law and has on more than one occasion done yeoman service in preventing a mutilation of the law at the hands of vested interests. During the years 1911, 1912, 1913 alone, no less than 55 different bills seeking to weaken the tenement house law in some important respect were introduced in the Legislature and received the constant scrutiny and attentions of the committee. Because of this watchfulness and the opposition made manifest to such measures, none of the bills was passed. Had not the Tenement House Committee been on guard, it is fair to assume that many of these measures would have been passed and become laws to the great detriment of the living conditions of millions of people.

Added importance attaches to the success of the housing campaign in New York City as it marked a new epoch in the interest of housing throughout the country. In Chicago a City Homes Association undertook in 1900 a general survey of the housing conditions of that city, of which there had never been any systematic study, with the possible exception of that included in the report of the "slums" of the United States by the United States Department of Labor, published in 1894.[1] The investigation by the association led in time to a new housing law, which improved materially the standards of space, light and air required in tenement construction. The move-

[1] The slums of Baltimore, Chicago, New York and Philadelphia. The Federal Bureau of Labor. Seventh Special Report (1894).

ment of 1900 culminated in 1912 in the appointment of a special committee on housing by the Association of Commerce of the City, whose 4,000 members formed a widely representative organization of business men in Chicago.

In many other places throughout the country the existence of bad housing conditions would have remained generally unknown at this time had not workers in the homes of the poor iterated and reiterated the conditions found in the alleys and poorer streets. Numerous illustrations might be cited of interest in housing developing from this type of first-hand knowledge. For example, it led the Associated Charities of Washington, D. C., in 1902 to form a Committee on the Improvement of Housing Conditions, which definitely set about investigating housing conditions. This work was taken up by the Homes Commission, appointed by President Roosevelt, to consider housing and general social conditions in Washington. Another outcome of the interest of the Associated Charities in housing conditions was the incorporation of a Sanitary Housing Company, backed by the same men as those constituting the Committee on the Improvement of Housing Conditions of the A. C. It was launched as a business philanthropy, paying four per cent. return. It was this first-hand knowledge of housing conditions that early led the Charity Organization Society of Youngstown, Ohio, to focus its attention upon the housing problem. As a result of its investigation into living conditions and a year of agitation for better housing, the Modern Homes Company was incorporated with an authorized capital stock of $100,000, soon to be increased to $500,000, and another successful enterprise was added to the "philanthropy and five per cent" building movement.

Other instances might be cited, but that of the Associated Charities of Columbus, which is typical, must suffice. After a careful and intensive investigation in

1910, the association took steps to drive home to the public conscience the evils of bad housing. At its invitation a number of city officials, including the Mayor and some newspaper reporters made a tour of inspection, which led to the drafting of a remarkable housing code by the head of the city Law Department. By keeping up a constant agitation during the months in which the code was in process of formation, by securing for it the endorsement of the Society of Architects, the Real Estate Association, the Builders' Exchange, besides many non-technical organizations, including the Federation of Labor, those interested in housing were able to create sufficient public opinion for it to become law. To see that the code was enforced, that it was amended by its friends, if amendments were found necessary, and to agitate for higher ideals in housing a committee of one hundred was organized.

The year following (1911), the first National Conference on Housing was held in New York City under the auspices of the newly-formed National Housing Association. This conference stands out as a landmark in the growth of that public interest in the problem of housing to which family case workers had contributed no mean part.

The Movement to Prevent Tuberculosis and the Charity Organization Movement

Because of the growing conviction that tuberculosis is a fertile cause of poverty, the New York Charity Organization Society appointed in 1902[1] a standing Committee on the Prevention of Tuberculosis, and so began the first active popular campaign in this country to secure adequate treatment looking to the cure of poor consumptives, and to impress upon all the people the communicable and

[1] Three years earlier the society had appointed a special committee to report on a proposed plan for a state sanitorium for consumptives.

curable nature of the disease.[1] The new committee soon began active service, creating a sub-committee on the treatment of tuberculosis cases, which, for approximately a year, cared for all such cases while studying the subject in the light of this experience. The magnitude of the problem so impressed itself on all that in 1904 there was launched the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, in the formation of which the New York Charity Organization Society participated through the active interest of its general secretary. Although the new national association soon gained public confidence and a substantial measure of public support, the New York Society still continued its committee to carry on intensively local educational campaigns through exhibits, lectures, leaflets and motion pictures. By 1905 it was engaged in a study of the possibility of country employment for consumptives, was investigating local lodging houses, and in conjunction with the national association was carrying on a National Tuberculosis Exhibition, visited by a quarter of a million people. Largely through the committee's activities, the first fresh air classes in New York's public schools, and among the first in the country, were established in 1909. These classes were intended for children who might be termed "pre-tuberculous," that is, children who are anemic, run-down, living in families where there were cases of tuberculosis, and who, if left alone, would in all probability develop the disease. The work of the committee also resulted in increasing the number of tuberculosis clinics in the city and led to the organization of an association among them looking to a better handling of the local problem.[2]

[1] The proposal for a committee came from a settlement worker. See Robert Hunter, "Relation between Social Settlements and Charity Organization," *Journal of Pol. Econ.*, Vol. XI, p. 87 (1902).

[2] This Association starting with six clinics in 1906 had grown in six years to approximately thirty, reaching 20,000 annually. Nearly all were established by the Committee for the Prevention of Tuberculosis of the New York Society.

The interest of charity organization societies in attacking tuberculosis as a cause of poverty was by no means limited to the New York Society. As early as 1903 several other societies [1] had organized anti-tuberculosis committees, which were soon carrying on local educational campaigns and agitating for more adequate care of those already afflicted. Other societies followed their example. Sometimes the pioneer work of such a special committee eventuated in an independent association to carry forward the work.[2]

In a number of communities, as for example, Boston and Buffalo, the local charity organization society acted as midwife, so to speak, for the local anti-tuberculosis association, stimulating the formation of this new ally in the fight against poverty.[3] In other communities, notably Pittsburgh and Chicago, where the charity organization society did not initiate the campaign against tuberculosis, the closest kind of coöperation existed. In some places the president and secretary of the charity organization society were members of the executive committee of the anti-tuberculosis association. Again one finds the new movement at first recruiting its executive secretaries from the ranks of family social workers or as in the early days in Colorado Springs, sharing a secretary with the local charity organization society.

The growing interest in the cure and prevention of tuberculosis explains the active support given by many charity organization societies about this time to fresh air work, especially for children. Agitation for playgrounds and open air schools, the provision of summer outings and

[1] Notably the Associated Charities of Washington, D. C., and Minneapolis, Minn.

[2] As, for illustration, in Washington, D. C., and Atlanta, Ga.

[3] Savannah, Ga., presents an interesting reversal in the early relationship of the two movements. There the need for a family agency grew out of the conditions revealed by a local anti-tuberculosis committee. Previous to this the Charity Organization Society of Colorado Springs had been organized to care for the tubercular poor, many of whom were "homeless men," attracted there by its climate.

baby-saving campaigns characterize this period of history of many societies.

Since these pioneer days the crusade against the great White Plague has become an independent movement of national proportions. Further reference to it here would not be necessary were it not for the fact that the interstate traffic in the tubercular poor has constituted a peculiarly difficult problem to societies in the West and South-West especially, in the "health resort" states. Many who go to these localities for their health because of their fame as a cure for tuberculosis, soon spend their all. Conditions became so acute at one time in Los Angeles that the local Associated Charities sent a circular letter to different societies, the boards of health, and the press in all parts of the United States and Europe, protesting against the practice of sending persons suffering from tuberculosis who were in a condition of actual or immediately prospective indigency. To help meet this situation a bill was introduced in Congress in 1916 by Congressman Kent of California. The bill, subsequently defeated after considerable discussion, provided for a government subsidy not to exceed seventy-five cents per day per patient for the care of indigent tuberculous persons who were not legally residents in the state where they were temporarily located, on condition that the authorities in that place, or some one else, paid an equal amount. Opinions in charity organization circles, while not unanimous in opposing the measure, were almost so. On the ground that the bill if passed "would increase the amount of lonely and neglected misery" by increasing the migration of destitute tuberculous people to climatic resorts, the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity passed resolutions opposing the bill. It held that anything which tended to lure people West, away from their homes, was mistaken kindness, since it is a delusion that climate cures

tuberculosis, and to sacrifice home and friends for climate is often to sacrifice a greater good for a less. It was further held that a heavy, if not the heaviest part of the problem, is not the care of the patient but of the family dependent upon the patient, for which the bill in question made no provision. Experience had taught charity organization workers to view the problem of the tubercular as a family as well as an individual problem.[1]

Juvenile Probation and the Movement for Charity Organization

It is but inevitable, such is the unity of family life, that charity organization societies should be interested in the wise handling of juvenile delinquency. In 1900 the Buffalo Charity Organization Society appointed a Committee on Probation, which was successful in securing the passage of a state law amending the city charter, so as to allow probation officers. Two months later, the Buffalo Juvenile Court, almost the first in the country, was established. Hand in hand with this work for the youth of the city, the Playground Committee of the society secured an appropriation from the City Council of $1,500 for a municipal playground and gymnasium, the first in the city.[2]

About the same time (1901) the New York Society placed a woman probation officer at the disposal of one of the magistrate's courts and later of the children's division of the Court of Special Sessions, to demonstrate the necessity for adding probation officers in adequate

[1] Emphasis on the value of peace of mind in the cure of tuberculosis led the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor to inaugurate its Home Hospital experiment whereby families coming to the attention of the Association in which one or more members were afflicted with tuberculosis were treated while keeping the family together in their own home. For the results of this interesting experiment see "Poverty and Tuberculosis," Publication No. 84, New York A. I. C. P. (1914).

[2] Anon., *Charities*, Vol. IV, No. 23, p. 12 (1900).

numbers to the machinery for the administration of justice.

Through the coöperation of the authorities of the school in which delinquent boys were confined, the Chicago Bureau of Charities [1] had a plan at this time by which it was informed of the approaching liberation of boys who were the victims of improper home surroundings and whose conduct while in confinement indicated that they were especially susceptible of good influences. In such instances, the Bureau's agents made a careful inquiry into the history of the boys, and where deemed advisable, arranged in advance of their release for some proper disposition of them. On release they were placed where it was believed they would have new and better opportunities in life.

As early as 1898 the Baltimore Society devoted a special number of its publication, *The Charities Record,* to pointing out the need of a compulsory school attendance law with competent and trustworthy officers to enforce it. The desirability of such a law and of a probation system for delinquent boys and girls were outstanding features of the society's report for 1902. The establishment by act of legislature of a Parental School in Colorado was largely due to the activities of the Denver Society.[2] It should be recalled that the probation system for children has had its remarkable development in this country since 1902.

A recent instance of coöperation between a charity organization society and the courts was the creation by the United Charities of Chicago early in 1919 of the position of court representative. This represents a broadening of the basis of coöperation over the days when interest centered almost wholly in juvenile cases. The

[1] Now the United Charities.

[2] Anon., "Organized Charity at Work," *Charities,* Vol. VIII, p. 40 (1902).

duties of this new office, which serves as intermediary between the society and the courts, are:

(1) To confer with visitors of the United Charities on cases which the visitors think need court action; to advise them whether the cases are ready to take to court; and to direct them in the preparation of the necessary evidence.

(2) To take the necessary steps to bring the cases to court, such as filing petitions in the Juvenile Court and taking out warrants in the Court of Domestic Relations.

(3) To present the cases in court, bringing in the visitors only when their personal testimony is indispensable.

(4) To act as a go-between and interpreter between the various courts of the city and the visitors of the United Charities, in order that a better understanding of principle and function may be brought about on both sides.[1]

Legal Aid and Charity Organization

When one realizes the many legal aspects of much family social work, and that family rehabilitation often includes legal aid as well as relief, it is not surprising that a number of charity organization societies have long been interested in securing legal justice for their clients. This interest has usually taken the form of coöperation with local Legal Aid Societies. However, in a few instances, as in Baltimore and Buffalo, charity organization societies early established legal aid bureaus of their own. More recent instances of this development have been in St. Paul, where the United Charities has a legal aid department, and Chicago, whose United Charities recently amalgamated with the Legal Aid Society of that city.[2] The outstanding advantages resulting from the amalgamation are the districting of the legal aid service and the supplying of the services of trained social case

[1] Anon., "Court Representative for Charities," *The Survey*, Vol. XLII, p. 875 (1919).

[2] September, 1919.

workers for those cases in which the social aspects are as important if not more so than the legal. These advantages are secured through placing social workers, specially trained in legal aid, in five of the ten district offices of the United Charities. In the general offices are four attorneys, the director of the legal aid bureau, and two social workers.

Improving the Machinery of Legal Justice [1]

A few societies were not content with rendering legal aid alone. They became interested in the machinery itself of legal justice, particularly as administered in the inferior criminal courts. "To the poor, especially to the ignorant and foreign-born poor, these courts represent the justice of the land. It is through them with their summary procedure, and the enormous number, range and variety of their cases, rather than through the courts of superior jurisdiction that the social conditions of these people are materially affected."[2] Thus, in 1909, the Buffalo Society took an active part in the passage of the City's Courts Laws, under which all the lower criminal and civil courts of the city were reorganized.

The year following, the New York Charity Organization Society created a Committee on Criminal Courts, the pioneer of its kind. The recent enactment of the Inferior Criminal Courts Act effecting important reforms in their administration had furnished an opportune time for the creation of such a committee to take cognizance of the special problems of these courts and by coöperating with the magistrates and justices, to aid in their solution.

In 1912 the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities created a similar Committee on Inferior Courts. Among its first

[1] Work in this field did not begin until after the close of this chapter. However, it is included here as a later part of that development in some societies which culminated in the establishment of distinct departments dealing exclusively with social conditions.

[2] Twenty-ninth Annual Report of The Charity Organization Society of the City of New York, p. 71 (1911).

tasks were a campaign for an adequate building for the children's court of Brooklyn and the establishment of the finger print system in the Magistrates Courts in the city.

Within three years of the time of the creation of the Committee on Criminal Courts of the New York Society the system of fining prostitutes was abolished and the finger print system of dealing with vagrants adopted. A children's court, with a paid staff of probation officers, was developed, and a new children's court building, afterward erected, was assured.

In all these changes the Committee on Criminal Courts played an active part, placing at the disposal of the judges expert service of various kinds. In 1915 the committee's bill amending generally the Inferior Criminal Courts Act of the City of New York became law, resulting in an independent children's court; speedier justice by granting magistrates power to sentence all misdemeanants; the creation of a departmental court for all cases where city or state departments are the complainants, the consolidation of magistrates' courts, the reorganization of the probation system, the extension of the finger print system to cover the entire Greater New York, and improvements in the administration of the Domestic Relations Court, the first in the United States.

Departments for Improving Social Conditions

The movements just noted which stressed the prevention of poverty at first functioned in many places through separate committees of the local charity organization society. In several of the larger societies these committees ultimately were brought together to form a distinct department in the society's organization to which the appellation Department for Improving Social Conditions, or a similar title, was attached. Thus in 1907 the New York Society, which by its pioneer work for housing reform and the prevention of tuberculosis, had early be-

come the most distinguished representative of societies undertaking preventive work, created a Department for the Improvement of Social Conditions, thus organizing for more efficient administration the constructive social undertakings already in operation and providing for expansion in such directions as the needs of the city might demand and the resources of the society permit.

In 1912 the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities created a Department of Social Betterment by combining its previously existing Committee on the Prevention of Tuberculosis and the Tenement House Committee, and adding a newly formed Committee on Inferior Courts. The year following the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor created its Department of Social Welfare to foster "preventive and constructive social measures for the welfare of the poor of the city as distinguished from relief measures—affecting particular individuals and families." [1] It has aimed to make its work supplement rather than duplicate the similar department of the New York Charity Organization Society.

These new departments aim to attack the causes of poverty by organizing educational crusades, by advocating state legislation, municipal ordinances and budget appropriations and by aiding in law enforcement. They are the logical development in a sense of the many extra activities which charity organization societies added to their day's work during the period under review. In reality, the work of these departments is the work of a civic organization devoted to social reform. They might just as appropriately be separate organizations since they have nothing to do with the direct care and treatment of maladjusted families, but they have a large and useful field of their own. They enjoy the services of experienced experts, working under the head of the department. Financial support often comes from distinct

[1] See Anon., *The Survey*, Vol. XXIX, p. 895 (1913).

sources, while the budgets of such departments are planned apparently with complete independence of the other work of the society.

The Charity Organization Movement and the Care of Dependent Children

Family social workers have long taken an interest in the care of dependent children who, for one reason or another, are deprived of the birthright of their parents' care. As early as 1882 the Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania was launched, largely through the efforts of those identified with the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity. Charity organization societies elsewhere took up the movement for a better handling of the problem of dependent children. To their inspiration it was due that the number of charitable societies which care for the poor, deserted, neglected and exposed children increased in a very rapid manner.[1]

Not only have they been interested in the establishment of children's aid societies, but everywhere progressive charity organization societies have fought against institutional treatment for children and have exerted their influence on the side of child placing. Thus, to cite a more recent illustration; when the Department of Public Charities of New York City, then under the direction of an experienced family worker,[2] reorganized in 1915, the work of its Bureau of Dependent Children for the purpose of placing orphaned and other dependent children under the age of eight in families of their own religious faith instead of in private child-caring institutions,[3] as

[1] Ashrott, "Poverty and Its Relief in the United States," p. 14; quoted by Robert Treat Paine, Jr., "Pauperism in the Great Cities," *Lend-a-Hand*, Vol. XII, p. 203 (1894).

[2] John A. Kingsbury.

[3] The plan of placing young dependent children in family homes in preference to institutions was in harmony with the White House Conference in 1909, approved then by Catholics, Jews and Protestants and indorsed in practice by charity organization societies everywhere.

had been the practice in the past, it received some of its heartiest support from the family welfare agencies of the city.[1] Approximately $150,000 was contributed by philanthropic citizens to meet for three years the administrative expenses of the plan.[2]

Philanthropic Publication

Because of their early interest in methods of work and in standards, charity organization workers, as was seen in the last chapter, were pioneers in the field of philanthropic publication.[3]

The first successful effort in this country, however, to give social workers a publication comparable to the physician's medical journal was made in 1901 by the New York Charity Organization Society, when by powers conferred in its charter to "promote social reform" it launched *Charities* as a weekly publication.[4] This was a landmark in the field of philanthropic publications.

With the founding of *Charities* in 1901, the realization of the need of an organ for all interested in problems of the common welfare that should be truly national in scope rapidly crystallized and several magazines were united with it. The first of these mergers occurred in 1905, when *The Commons,* which had been published at the

[1] The New York C. O. S. and the A. I. C. P.

[2] Unfortunately much of the excellent start made at this time was afterward lost through a less enlightened leadership in the Department.

[3] See pages 234-238.

[4] The tap root of *Charities* was a magazine of the same name founded in 1897 as a monthly news sheet for members of the New York Society and the year following made into a weekly publication. *The Charities Review,* mentioned in the text, as founded in 1891 by the New York Society, was taken over by the New York Society in 1901 after it had been for a while under the management of an independent corporation organized for the purpose in 1898. It was renamed *Charities,* and combined with it was the weekly publication of that name. It was the personal support and interest of the president of the New York Society and of a few philanthropic persons under the lead of the society, which made possible both *Charities Review* and *Charities.*

Chicago neighborhood house of that name under the editorship of Professor Graham Taylor, was united with it, the combined periodicals using the joint name of *Charities and The Commons,* which name was retained until 1909, when the present name of *The Survey* was adopted. In 1906, *Jewish Charity,* edited by Dr. Lee K. Frankel, was also merged with *Charities and The Commons.* In each merger the society interpreted its stewardship in the broadest way, and the various magazines merged were accepted in a spirit of trust. In 1905 the Central Council of the New York Society appointed, as a constituent committee of the society, a publication committee to "give national breadth and effect to the work of the magazine." This committee included such signal leaders in social movements as Jacob A. Riis, Jane Addams and Joseph Lee. From the beginning the New York Society made current appropriations of usually $3,000 a year, and was financially liable for its debts. Although it held title, the magazine was in no sense an organ of the New York Society. Full editorial responsibility was from the first vested in the editor. The progress of the journal from then on has been steady. It early inaugurated a field work department for the extension of charity organization principles which was destined to open a new epoch in the history of the charity organization movement.[1]

In 1907-1908 the publication committee carried through the Pittsburgh Survey the most suggestive civic event of the time. Few of the offspring of the charity organization movement have had more far-reaching consequences or given greater promise of the future than the Pittsburgh Survey, the pioneer social survey in this country. Interpretation of hours, wages, housing, court procedure and all the rest, in terms of standard of living and the recognition that the basis for judging of social conditions is the measure of life they allow to those

[1] See pp. 337-406.

affected by them, constitute the very essence of the developments that have since taken place in social work.[1]

In 1912 a point was reached where "far-seeing stewardship called for a national, self-dependent organization," and the parent society not only launched *The Survey* as an independent venture, but placed it on a mutual basis. Thereupon the New York Charity Organization Society turned over to the Survey Associates, Inc.,[2] the publication of *The Survey,* the maintenance of the *Survey* press service, and other activities theretofore carried on under the Charities Publication Committee. In recounting the services which the charity organization movement and those in its ranks have rendered to the general social work of the country, few contributions will rank higher than the fostering of *The Survey* and its predecessors in the days when a national journal devoted to the common welfare seemed all but impossible.[3]

The Charity Organization Movement and Training for Social Work

Because certain leaders in charity organization early recognized the value of training for their field of service, and because the charity organization movement has been surpassed by none in its efforts to perfect the technique of its work nor in the importance it has attached to

[1] The spread of the social survey as an organized method of social discovery has since been most rapid. So great was the demand for information on social surveys that in 1912 the Russell Sage Foundation initiated a Department of Surveys and Exhibits.

[2] The Survey Associates is a membership corporation, chartered November 4, 1912, under the laws of the state of New York. Its stated purpose is "to advance the cause of constructive philanthropy by the publication and circulation of books, pamphlets, and periodicals, and by conducting any investigations useful or necessary for the preparation therefor."

[3] Mr. Jeffrey R. Brackett has named "the founding and fostering of *The Charities Review* and the Summer School in Philanthropic Work" as constituting two debts of obligation to the New York Society resting on all social workers. See Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Present Opportunities for Training in Charitable Work," *Charities,* Vol. VI, p. 423 (1901).

training, its contribution to social education in the United States has been unique. As charity organization societies had a considerable part in creating a demand for trained service, it was but natural that they should feel some responsibility for helping to supply the need.

As early as 1882 the New York Society began a library of books on charity for circulation among its workers. Other societies followed the experiment. In 1891 the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities began conducting a conference course and study class to help in the training of its workers, including its friendly visitors. By 1892 the Boston Society had worked out a definite plan for the education of friendly visitors and for maintaining their interest. In 1894 the New York Society conducted a course of twelve lectures on practical social problems. By the later nineties the Boston Associated Charities adopted a plan, destined to be followed with modifications by several other societies, whereby it paid people to learn the technique of charity organization, provided they seemed to possess the other necessary qualifications. A not unusual feature of the winter's program in a number of societies was a course of lectures on social and philanthropic subjects. In 1901 the Philadelphia Society organized the General Secretary's Weekly Class of Workers in Training. Other societies followed, giving similar instruction to their workers.

Although a number of American university teachers have made invaluable contributions to the charity organization movement through the social vision imparted to their students, who later became identified with the new point of view in charity,[1] the first suggestions for a professional school of social work "came not from colleges or universities, but from the members of the International and the National Conference of Charities, and the first

[1] Of these special mention should be made of Francis G. Peabody at Harvard University, Herbert B. Adams at Johns Hopkins University, Richard T. Ely at the University of Wisconsin, and Simon N. Patten at the University of Pennsylvania.

professional classes were organized, not by an educational institution, but by the directors and staff of a private charitable agency." [1] It was at the International Congress of Charities in 1893 that Miss Anna L. Dawes, of Pittsfield, Mass., in a significant paper on "The Need of Training Schools for a New Profession," pointed out the desirability of a new course of study "in some established institution or in an institution by itself, or by the old-fashioned method never yet improved upon for actual development, the method of experimental training as the personal assistant of some skilled worker," in which it should be possible for those who wished to take up charitable work "to find some place of studying it as a profession." [2] At the National Conference of Charities and Correction of 1897, and at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in 1898, Miss Mary E. Richmond voiced still more definitely the pressing need of such schools.[3]

The first steps toward establishing a professional school were taken in the summer of 1898 when the New York Charity Organization Society organized a training class in "applied philanthropy," [4] which became in 1901 the Summer School for Philanthropic Workers, and, in 1904, The New York School of Philanthropy. The last-named provided systematic instruction for the full academic year of eight months designed to meet the needs of beginners wishing to prepare themselves for social service either as professional or volunteer workers.[5] Before the year was out the school was handsomely endowed.[6] Each

[1] Edith Abbott, "Education for Social Work," Report of the Commissioner of Education, Vol. I, p. 347 (1915).

[2] See Report of International Congress of Charities, seventh section, p. 20 (1893).

[3] Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, p. 182 (1897).

[4] Dr. Philip W. Ayres was the director.

[5] Dr. Edward T. Devine, general Secretary of the New York Charity Organization Society, became the director of the new enterprise.

[6] This endowment was increased through bequests under the will of late John S. Kennedy to $1,000,000.

successive year has witnessed the enlargement and enrichment of the curriculum. Its diploma is now awarded only after the satisfactory completion of two years of work. In 1919 it changed its name to The New York School of Social Work, a title more descriptive of the scope of its work.

Special mention has been made of The New York School of Social Work, not only because it was the pioneer school in the field, but also because it has remained a pioneer and is the only school in the Association of Training Schools that is conducted by a charity organization society. This does not mean, however, that charity organization workers have not taken important parts in the work of the other training schools. The Pennsylvania School for Social Service, organized in 1910 by a number of social agencies of the city, is under especial obligation to the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity for hearty coöperation. Even where the professional school is under the auspices of a college or university as at Simmons College and Western Reserve University, usually the district offices of the local charity organization society afford the student in training some of his or her most valuable field work experience. To meet "the problem of the charity organization worker who is already at work, but who seeks further opportunity for training," the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, established, in June, 1910, a month's institute under the auspices of the New York School of Philanthropy. The Institute was not proposed to be a school using the usual lecture and recitation method, but a month's conference of professional workers in which most of the work is of a practical character and the instruction of a most informal nature and given by group leaders. The general secretaries attending the Institute were in charge of one leader, the district workers in charge of another, and the case workers in charge of a third,

each a specialist in his or her particular line. The first institute proved so successful that it has been continued ever since.[1]

No one factor has more hastened the recognition of social work as a profession than the advent of training schools, and no movement has in turn contributed more toward the technique of social case work without which the curriculum of a training school would be sadly incomplete than the movement whose history is here recorded.

The Beggar and the Vagrant[2]

Although the period 1896 to 1904 was distinguished by the many efforts which charity organization societies put forth to attack the causes of poverty, noteworthy progress was made in meeting certain problems with which the oldest societies had long labored, such as begging, vagrancy, desertion and non-support.

The handling of the first two of these problems had been far from satisfactory in many communities. Philadelphia vied with Chicago in the number of its beggars and vagrants. The more successful beggars of the former city were "earning" from two to four dollars a day, according as they "worked" on the more modest streets or in fashionable districts. This estimate did not take into account big days, favored, well-paid-for spots, or special infirmities.[3]

In Baltimore, the abuse of keeping lodgers in the station-houses with its encouragement to lawlessness was notorious. For years the almshouse was used as a winter resort for tramps and homeless men, the city transporta-

[1] For a number of years it has been held directly under the auspices of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation.

[2] A vagrant or tramp is an able-bodied man without any visible means of support and without a fixed abode. In this last respect he differs from the typical beggar. A characteristic frequently common to both is that of being "work-shy."

[3] Anon., "Suppression of Mendicancy," *Charities,* Vol. IX, p. 486 (1902).

tion fund administered in a haphazard and often harmful fashion, and city money appropriated to some of the medical agencies and so-called charities which were not worthy of public aid. Efforts to change these conditions had been mostly fruitless because the mayor and most of the public officials were not actively sympathetic with reform.[1]

The inadequacy of the police station system of caring for the homeless early led charity organization societies in a number of places to erect wayfarers' lodges and to maintain wood-yards as work tests, but these were often inadequate in accommodation [2] or did little "case work," [3] frequently being used as substitutes for all case work.

Soup kitchens, bread lines and other unwise philanthropies which supplied lodging far below cost and no questions asked were constant inducements for the "work-shy" to flock to centers in which they flourished. The care-free citizen who prefers to sacrifice the small amount demanded by the mendicant rather than spend time in investigating "his story" added further to the size of the problem. Although Massachusetts could claim a state law which made it a crime to beg and which, moreover, was enforced, she was the exception rather than the rule.[4] Moreover, such a state law merely solved the problem for Massachusetts. The course of the work-shy vagrant is always in the line of least resistance. Vagrancy, and to a less extent begging, are problems that cannot be solved on state lines, much less by municipalities, except by concerted action.

The numbers of beggars and vagrants in each community were in inverse ratio to the intelligence and vigor

[1] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 139 (1903).

[2] In 1900 it appears 40,000 lodgings were supplied by the police stations in Philadelphia. In order to remove the excuse for this situation, the Philadelphia Society began in 1901 the erection of a third wayfarers' lodge.

[3] Alice Willard Solenberger, "One Thousand Homeless Men," pp. vii and viii (1911).

[4] Anon., "Treatment of Vagrants," *Charities,* Vol. VII, p. 412 (1901).

with which each sought to meet the situation. In a number of places the methods employed marked distinct advances over what had previously obtained in that they included the coöperation of the local police department. In response to a request from the Associated Charities the Police Department of the City of Boston in 1897 detailed two special officers to look after beggars and vagrants. In citizens' dress, and with no regular beat, they did far more toward discovering and arresting these offenders than the regular patrolman had ever been able to do. According to the police rules, officers are supposed to warn beggars and explain the law to them, but if the men appear to be habitual offenders the officers, by engaging them in conversation, are often able to arrest them as vagrants on their own statements. All records of arrest and sentence since the beginning have been kept in the registration bureau of the Associated Charities. The officers reported to the Associated Charities daily, and from time to time referred to it such persons as it seemed possible to educate without first depriving them of liberty. At first the offenders were sent on short sentences of from two to six months to the House of Correction. Under the law, the judges began sending the men to the State Farm, where the sentence was indeterminate, the maximum being two years. There the men were kept steadily at work and had a chance to learn some useful occupation. It was felt that keeping them in this reformatory under strict prison discipline during the summer months would have good results.[1] The refusal of the police authorities to lodge wayfarers at the various police stations also helped to reduce the size of the problem in Boston.

The New York Society had long had a standing Committee on Vagrancy. Nearly twenty years earlier the society first took direct action relative to street begging

[1] Anon., "Suppression of Mendicancy," *Charities*, Vol. IX, p. 483 (1902).

in New York by the appointment of special officers to coöperate with the Police Department in keeping the evil within bounds. In 1897 the service was discontinued when the Board of Police Commissioners of New York City detailed a squad of special vagrancy officers to cooperate with the Society's Committee on Mendicancy. This arrangement, together with one with the Department of Public Charities, resulted in closing the police stations and the lodging house barge of the Department of Charities to transient lodgers, and in sending all applicants for gratuitous lodging to the Wayfarers' Lodge maintained by the Society. Unfortunately the history of this experiment was one of rapid disintegration, so that in 1901 the Society found it necessary to reënforce its efforts to suppress begging. This it did by appointing a special Mendicancy Officer [1] of its own, and soon thereafter the city detailed six police officers to work under him as a mendicancy squad. These men began an active campaign to clear the streets of professional beggars. All beggars caught were sent for six months to the workhouse. As a result several hundred beggars left the city and seldom was one to be seen on the streets. A prominent feature of the crusade was that help was given by those to whom the Society could turn for this purpose to any who could be persuaded to adopt a more honest means of livelihood.

For the first time in the history of the city the problem of mendicancy was adequately dealt with. Unfortunately in 1906 the city, on the plea of economy, felt compelled to withdraw the services of the police who had been detailed to the work of the Mendicancy Committee of the Society, and the year following, treatment of individual cases by this committee was discontinued, as it was felt that it would be useless to continue employing a special Mendicancy Officer without the coöperation of the

[1] James Forbes, "The Work of the Mendicancy Police in New York," *Charities*, Vol. XI, pp. 576-8 (1903).

Police Department of the city. Although it was unusual for police to be under the direction of a private society, it must nevertheless be admitted that the plan worked admirably.[1]

In Indianapolis where, in the winter of 1900-01, a class of blind beggars along with others, more or less infested the streets of the city, the Charity Organization Society assured the city authorities that honest persons desiring to lead a more honorable life should have the opportunity. Often the Society offered to keep them several days without work or price, but no one was found who could be thus kept for more than a day or two. Good use of this fact took away the excuse, "I have to beg for a living." A decided victory was gained with the authorities, especially the police, in that they no longer felt that this class was deserving of the indulgence they had formerly been given. The Society then employed a special officer who, with the police and police judge, nearly cleared the streets of mendicants. The work was not entirely repressive, as constructive work with some was carried on with good results.

The lamentable conditions in Baltimore, already mentioned, were radically improved when the Mayor's office, in the period under review, turned to the local Charity Organization Society to investigate and advise on certain cases of applicants for free transportation. Within a year the Mayor's fund for this purpose was made more effective, though the amount of it was largely reduced.[2] At the request of the president of the police commissioners, the Charity Organization Society aided the commissioners in doing away with the abuse of lodgers in the

[1] During the fifteen months of the Mendicancy Squad, Mr. Forbes and his seven men arrested 18,063 persons, while all the other police of the city combined arrested only 5,965. Prof. Charles R. Henderson expressed the opinion in 1910 that the New York Society had grappled with the problem of vagrancy as no other organization in the country had done. *The City Club Bulletin* of Chicago, p. 149 (1910).

[2] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 139 (1903).

station-houses. The direct result was the important municipal reform of the substitution for such lodgings with their encouragement to shiftlessness, of relief in work at the friendly inn for all able-bodied homeless men. "The real reform came when a reform mayor appointed a board of trustees of the poor who believed in the principles of the Charity Organization Society and the majority of whom were actually managers of the society. Cooperation between the society and the city hall, which had been valuable as a means of education, was replaced by the better state of things in which the city's own officials" did "their own specific work comparatively well." [1]

It was not, however, until after the close of the period of history covered by this chapter that Baltimore took its most effective step in attacking its problems of beggary and vagrancy. In 1912 at the suggestion of the secretary of the Federated Charities, formerly the Charity Organization Society, a number of plain clothes men were assigned to duty as mendicancy officers. Their first obligation was to observe the distinction between beggars and vagrants, warning the former of their offense and conducting the offenders to their homes and reporting their names and addresses to the Federated Charities, the Federated Jewish Charities or the St. Vincent de Paul Society, which societies had previously agreed to visit promptly and to deal with each as with any other case of need.

In the case of a vagrant the mendicancy officer had no alternative but to arrest. Vagrants under sixteen years of age are taken at once to the juvenile court to be dealt with in the same manner as other juvenile offenders. Vagrants between sixteen and twenty-one are sent to the proper custodial or correctional institution, the magistrate having no power under the law other than that of commitment. The prisoner may, however, be held in custody for

[1] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 139 (1903).

a reasonable time, pending an investigation by one of the three societies mentioned. If it be ascertained that the prisoner is a runaway child, a defective or a delinquent of any kind, who should be restored to parents or friends or public authorities, the magistrate may release him in such custody as the case may require. A similar procedure is used in the case of adult vagrants, except that if the investigation requires a long time, a jury trial may be asked for by the state's attorney. If the accused be found to be a deserting husband or a mental defective, he may be released. Otherwise, he may be brought to trial and committed under the law. It is declared that the working out of this plan has made Baltimore freer than ever of mendicants.[1]

A considerable element in the success of all the plans just described has been the coöperation of the local police department.[2] Even when no mendicancy squads were organized an efficient police department coöperating with the local charity organization society was able to accomplish much.

Throughout the period charity organization societies, believing that the care of the vagrant is peculiarly a governmental responsibility, and wishing to relieve themselves of the heavy expense of maintaining wayfarers' lodges, agitated for the erection of municipal lodging houses to replace police stations used for such purposes.

In New York City after many delays, the city had opened its municipal lodging house in 1898, thereby making unnecessary the society's Wayfarers' Lodge, which was accordingly discontinued. The city of Chicago followed suit in 1901, when it erected its municipal lodging house after a long agitation[3] by many of the social

[1] See Anon., *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIX, pp. 89, 90 (1912).

[2] This had been demonstrated for a number of years in Buffalo where the problem was well in hand. A campaign launched in 1914 by The Philadelphia S. O. C. in close coöperation with the Department of Public Safety resulted in fourteen months' time in removing over eleven hundred mendicants from the streets of Philadelphia.

[3] In 1899 the Chicago Bureau of Charities had appointed a special

workers of the city, one of whose number, trained by the Chicago Bureau of Charities, became the first head. Boston already had a Wayfarers' Lodge under the supervision of the Overseers of the Poor. In Philadelphia the local society met the increasing demands by the erection at considerable expense of a third Wayfarers' Lodge.[1]

Probably the greatest gain in the treatment of beggar or vagrant during the years under review was the growing realization that he needed "more help, more sympathy, more thought and care" [2] than he had been receiving. In the earlier days of the movement, the care of homeless men was viewed as a problem requiring separate [3] but more or less uniform treatment.[4] It was the realization that the homeless were being treated in an inadequate way that led those working in the Central District [5] of the Chicago society to begin, in 1900, the working out of a new plan of treatment for such cases. This consisted in applying to them the methods with certain adaptations, used in the social diagnosis and treatment of families.[6] The need for individualization of treatment of the homeless has since been increasingly recognized by all who

committee to investigate the problem of housing homeless men. Its report led to valuable results.

[1] In 1914 the society asked without success that the city take over its wayfarers' lodges to be conducted as municipal lodging houses. The society felt after having annually faced a deficit that it was spending huge sums of money annually "which should be used in another form of charity with which the city would be unable to cope." It accordingly closed its various lodges.

[2] In 1902 a special fellowship for the study of Homeless Men was established by the Philadelphia Society in coöperation with the University of Pennsylvania.

[3] An illustration is found in the case of the New York Society in the transfer in 1890 of the care of homeless cases from districts to a Central Committee.

[4] Some wayfarers' lodges and woodyards were run upon the blameworthy principle of assuming that where a youth or a man was given work (made for him) that there the agency's responsibility ended.

[5] In Chicago the Central District at the time under review was handling a majority of all such cases, many of which were transferred to it from other districts.

[6] An interesting account of the results of the new method is to be found in "One Thousand Homeless Men," by Alice Willard Solenberger (1911).

come into contact with the vagrant and the homeless. Thus for some years the Associated Charities of Boston and the Boston Provident Association have maintained a Joint Department for Helping Homeless Men. Likewise the New York Charity Organization Society and the local Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor maintain a Joint Application Bureau for Homeless Men. In each a secretary is employed who gives his full time to the problem of the homeless man and his efforts are devoted almost entirely to personal work with the men, seeking to get them the best medical treatment when needed, inducing others, especially young boys and men, to return to their homes in other cities; in short, doing all that may restore them to self-respect and independence.

More and more such fundamental preventive measures as education for efficiency and vocational guidance, are seen to have their bearing on the ultimate solution of the problem, while for those already well on the path of vagrancy, such measures are advocated as the closing of the railroads to the brake-beam or freight car deadhead, compulsory labor colonies, and the securing of interstate agreements to prevent "passing on," if no interstate law be possible.[1] It was in line with this last suggestion that a committee of the National Conference of Charities and Correction of 1903 drafted a transportation agreement which provides chiefly that free or charity-rate transportation shall be issued only on satisfactory proof that the applicant has at the point of destination a legal residence, employment or other definite means of support, or friends or relatives who will agree to provide for him; that such transportation shall be

[1] See O. F. Lewis, "Vagrancy in the United States" (1907). Dr. Lewis here shows that vagrancy is a national problem. He points out the following means of solution: (1) coöperation between railroads and local authorities in the prosecution of railroad trespassers; (2) municipal lodging houses under supervision of local health officials in all cities where there is a vagrancy problem, with compulsory labor colonies in each state.

clear through to the point of destination; and that each signer shall coöperate with each other to prevent the aimless sending of dependents about the country. One hundred and thirty-nine charity organization societies immediately obligated themselves in the matter.[1]

In 1907 a committee was appointed at the National Conference of Charities and Correction to create a nation-wide interest in the problem of vagrancy. In 1909 New York State passed a law creating the first farm colony in America "for the detention, human discipline, instruction and reformation of male adults committed thereto as tramps and vagrants." [2]

One of the first steps taken by the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity, founded in 1911, was the appointment of a committee on the problem of the homeless man to formulate a working program for all its members.

The Problem of Desertion and Non-support

An evil equal to, if not greater than, vagrancy, that has long perplexed family social workers is desertion and non-support.[3] Interest in the broken family has been in no sense local, as a study of the annual reports of societies in all parts of the country will testify, nor has it been of recent origin, though the first comprehensive studies of the problem were made in the years covered by this chapter.

[1] By 1917 this agreement was signed by more than 800 municipalities, state boards of charity, other public officials and charitable organizations.

[2] The legislative campaign leading up to the passage of the bill was conducted largely by a joint committee of the Charity Organization Society and the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor of New York City. As early as 1883 the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities had urged the need of a vagrant colony to help solve the problem.

[3] Reports of charitable societies showed in 1905 that from year to year deserted families formed between seven and thirteen per cent of the total number of families in charge. Twenty-five per cent of the commitments of children to institutions in New York City were attributed to desertion. See Lilian Brandt, "Five Hundred and Seventy-four Deserters and Their Families," p. 10 (1905).

In more insistent terms than ever before the demand came for some easily enforced law to procure from deserting husbands and fathers support for their wives and children. Societies appointed committees on wife desertion. Some, as the societies in New York State and in Denver, coöperated in securing more adequate legislation.

The first attempt to collect and present data which should help toward a better understanding of this problem was made by the Associated Charities of Boston in 1901, when Miss Zilpha D. Smith published a careful study of the two hundred and thirty-four deserted families which had been under the care of the society during the preceding year. In 1902 a special committee of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity made a study of two hundred and eleven cases of desertion and non-support under its care that year, which led to a discriminating classification of the types of deserters.[1] In the following year a bill drafted by the Society became law.

By 1903 the belief was so firmly rooted that something must be done to curb the evil that a conference on the subject was called by the New York Charity Organization Society, at which workers from Philadelphia, Buffalo, Brooklyn, New York, and near-by New Jersey towns exchanged opinions as to causes and remedies. As a result of this conference interest was further stimulated in many parts of the country, and resolutions were adopted the next week at the National Conference of Charities and Correction, petitioning the governors of the various states to exercise their power of extradition in the case of deserting men whenever occasion offered.

[1] The committee had, moreover, found that in two states there was no special law on the subject of desertion and non-support of wife and children, that there were sixteen states in which the only remedy for the wife was an application for divorce; ten in which a civil remedy was provided in the form of a judicial order against the husband to pay a certain sum for the support of his family; eighteen states in which desertion was a criminal offense, classed as a misdemeanor, and two in which it was classed as a felony.

Interest in studies of desertion and non-support did not cease with the conference called by the New York Society. In the same year this Society began a nation-wide inquiry into the problem. All the charity organization societies in the United States were invited to assist in gathering material by keeping special records of their cases of desertion during a year. As an outcome, an important intensive study was published in 1905 of 574 records of families which had been deserted by their male bread-winners.[1]

In 1904 the Associated Charities of Washington, D. C., made an exhaustive study of the laws of the various states on family desertion and non-support.[2] It was believed wise to have available all laws on the subject, in order that the best features in them could be considered in framing any new law where changes had been found necessary. The study revealed among other things the fact that a misdemeanor, being a crime, was apparently covered by the United States law requiring extradition, but that there was something like an understanding among some of the states that extradition should not be asked or granted for trifling offenses, which family desertion was considered in some quarters. "But," comments the author, "family desertion is not a trifling offense,

[1] The study concludes that "desertion is not an evil which can be eradicated by legislation alone. A good law acts as a deterrent to a certain extent," but "the chief value of a good law, well enforced, is that it expresses the estimation in which society holds men who shirk their obligations to their families, and that it relieves society of the necessity of assuming their responsibility. . . . Whatever can be done by legislation and wise treatment in other ways must be done, but the chief hope for the future lies in plans for eliminating the type of man which deserts and the type of woman which provokes desertion." These plans consist "in the providing of decent living conditions, and fair opportunities for work, and in the education of this generation of children and the next, and the next, and the next, in whatever makes for stability of character, for economic efficiency, for a realization of responsibility, and for a wholesome family life."

Lillian Brandt, "Five Hundred and Seventy-four Deserters and Their Families," pp. 62-64 (1905).

[2] The study was made by Mr. William H. Baldwin, one of the Board of Directors of the Society.

and if the obligation to grant extradition in case of it was well understood by those who have occasion to ask for it, there is no doubt that many men might be brought back under present laws." [1] Washington afterwards became one of the first cities to apply the work-house remedy to the problem. A law was passed in 1906 providing for the payment of fifty cents a day to the families of men under work-house sentence for non-support. The man is usually put on probation and has to pay a certain proportion of his wages to his family. Confirmed offenders are sent to the work-house, where they really have to work, and fifty cents a day from the proceeds of their labor is paid to their families. In one year there were 899 non-support cases. Of these 608 were placed on probation and paid through the police $38,319.65 to their families, while the payments to families for the labor of men in the work-house amounted to $2,340.[2]

A step of unusual promise in handling the problem was taken in 1911 by the United Hebrew Charities of New York City, when it created the National Desertion Bureau, whose efforts at bringing back deserting husbands are nation-wide. On starting the work the Bureau got back 174 deserters out of 249. As a result of this demonstration, New York City established, in 1913, a Bureau of Domestic Relations under the Department of Charities with the object of saving the city some of the money being spent in supporting children of deserters, and the year following, the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities began a similar plan whereby charity organization societies might coöperate in tracing and bringing back deserters. It should be recalled that special courts for dealing with cases of desertion and non-support are of recent date, the first in the country being established in New York City so recently as 1910.

[1] William H. Baldwin, "Family Desertion and Non-Support Laws," p. 38 (1904).

[2] See Judge William H. De Lacey, "Family Desertion and Non-Support," *The Survey*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 678-680 (1910).

Realizing that the effective handling of desertion cases requires a special knowledge of law and experience in court procedure, which the average district visitor does not possess, and which she can seldom take the time to acquire in view of the many other demands upon her, the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor in 1914 selected two visitors especially qualified for such work to take charge of all applications where desertion was given as a cause of the families' need for assistance. Commenting editorially on the plan, *The Survey* said,[1] "There are several advantages in thus specializing in family rehabilitation and relief in the larger cities. Visitors become skilled in determining whether the man has really deserted or is simply taking a brief vacation, sometimes in connivance with the wife, in order that relief may be more readily forthcoming for the children. Decision as to the necessity and legitimacy of giving relief to the family can be more quickly reached. The plan described has meant quicker and more adequate relief in some cases, and a saving in others, where giving material relief would have meant simply the encouraging and perpetuating of shiftless, unwholesome home conditions. . . . A visitor especially trained for this work can give to the worried, distressed woman at once information she needs, and in addition, through acquaintance with court procedure, enable her to present her case adequately to the court."

Changed Attitude Toward Relief-Giving

Beginning with the latter half of the nineties the practice of charity organization societies in the matter of relief-giving showed a marked change. Although it could be said that in 1895 a majority of societies both in numbers and influence maintained the principle of having no

[1] *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 322 (1914).

general fund for material relief, an investigation,[1] made in 1901, showed that of seventy-five societies, all but six provided immediate relief in urgent cases from funds, either emergency or general, in the hands of their agents. By the close of the period, 1896-1904, about one-half the charity organization societies of the country gave relief from their own funds for all cases, emergent and otherwise. The society founded in Atlanta in 1905 seems to have been the last charity organization society to be launched on a platform of no relief fund of any kind. It should not be inferred that in some quarters there was not stout opposition to any compromise with the principle that a charity organization society must ever be a non-relieving society. In practice many societies in the earlier days had failed to live up to this principle, but such a course was confessed with special reasons and apologies. From the time under review the theory as well as the practice of the majority of societies indicated a belief that the direct administration of relief by a charity organization society is not incompatible with good family social work.

The reasons for this change of position seem clear. If in a community where a charity organization society was organized, no relief agencies existed or none adequate for the needs, there was no practical course but for the new society to grant relief when needed from its own funds. In some communities the status of public education in matters of relief-giving seemed to require any society asking public support to justify its existence in quite concrete, tangible and immediate ways. Probably the biggest single factor bringing about the changed practice was the increasing importance attaching to material relief when adequate and skilfully administered. It was held that fear of material relief becoming a crutch upon which the worker would lean to the detriment of

[1] Charles M. Hubbard, "Relation of C. O. S. to Relief Societies and Relief-giving," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. VI, p. 783 (1901).

thorough-going case work was a confession of the failure of professional service. A well-trained worker will "understand the subordinate part which relief must take in the work of restoring a needy family to normal conditions, and will not neglect the more arduous lines of effort. Without the high standard of service no degree of division of functions will result in successful restorative work." [1]

During the period under review, material relief acquired a new dignity. The type of "adequate relief" which became the ideal of charity organization societies at the time "would have been heresy twenty-five years ago" wrote Mr. deForest, "if by adequate was meant, as is meant to-day, material aid as well as service." [2] The new conception of adequacy in relief was the direct result, in part at least, of the movements for the prevention of poverty which characterized the period. The importance of a protected childhood, of good housing, of public health, in short, of the environmental causes of poverty, increased the amount of material relief needed in all case work laying claim to adequacy.

Charity Organization Societies and the Relief Associations

If charity organization societies had had difficulties during the eighties with the old relief associations which had preceded them by thirty or forty years, by the new century their differences had largely been composed. In some places this was accomplished by such satisfactory coöperation between the two local organizations as to cause them to function almost as a unit. This was notably true in Boston where the Associated Charities still adhered to its no-relief fund policy, depending upon the Boston Provident Association and other

[1] Anon., *Charities*, Vol. IX, p. 17 (1902).

[2] Robert W. deForest, "Twenty-five Years and After," *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XIX, p. 1131 (1908).

relief-giving agencies and the benevolent individual for all the material relief needed in the care of its families. In Philadelphia the various relief agencies have continued to exist as separate agencies even though the local Society for Organizing Charity grants relief from its own funds. However, a spirit of marked coöperation obtains. In St. Louis the need for a second type of society was met by the local Provident Association becoming in deed, if not in name, a charity organization society.

Though entire coöperation marks the relationship between the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor and the Charity Organization Society of New York City, a merger of these two has never been effected, apparently for historical and personal reasons.[1] In 1902 the two organizations formed a working agreement that has been permanent. They maintain jointly an application bureau which has special responsibility for homeless men. In the departments of the respective societies whose concern is with the improving of social conditions, a definite effort has been made to avoid all duplication of effort. Though all overlapping of relief is avoided through the use of a Social Service Exchange, it nevertheless remains true that in the field of family case work, New York City has to-day two organizations with similar functions, each operating through district divisions covering the entire city.[2]

A more happy solution was found in Baltimore. From a situation in which the Charity Organization Society and the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor were working in the main through different district cen-

[1] See Robert W. deForest, "The Federation of Organized Charities," *Charities*, Vol. XII, pp. 21-22 (1904).

[2] The Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor by the adoption of modern methods of case work has become in all but name a charity organization society. In the later nineties the A. I. C. P., as it is usually called, discontinued relief for cases in charge of the "C. O. S.," thereby requiring the latter to raise relief for all its families, which was made possible by a change in its constitution permitting the raising of relief as the individual need for the same arose.

ters with separate registration and application bureaus, each employing a different system of record histories and treatment cards, and each organization holding separate annual meetings, there came about a federation of the work of the two societies whereby there were joint meetings of agents, joint registration of families, joint districts and, above all, a common secretary. Families coming to the joint bureaus were assigned so that the Charity Organization Society continued to seek out the material sources of relief, but where such sources were lacking and in the treatment of emergent and temporary needs, the resources of the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor were drawn upon. It was only a matter of time when the work of the two societies had become so much a unit that it required but a change in name to complete the union.[1]

In many ways the experience of Baltimore was duplicated in Chicago. By 1904 it was obvious to all concerned that the work of the Chicago Bureau of Charities and the Chicago Relief and Aid Society had gradually begun to overlap. Under a secretary trained in the methods of modern charity,[2] the Relief and Aid Society had adopted charity organization principles.[3] The Bureau of Charities, on the other hand, had abandoned its position of being an organizing body only, and the way was thus paved for a consolidation of the two organizations which was effected in 1909, after one previous attempt.[4] The consolidation apparently appealed to the imagination and business judgment of the public. The United Char-

[1] The combined organization became the Federated Charities of Baltimore.

[2] Sherman C. Kingsley.

[3] The Relief and Aid Society had before this all the earmarks of a defunct organization. They advertised, for example, that all money received went into relief and none for salaries.

[4] It was finally accomplishing by the boards of both organizations resigning and the appointment of a new one, representing both groups. The success of the plan was, however, due in the main to the efforts of Mr. Ernest P. Bicknell, General Secretary of the Chicago Bureau of Charities and his successor, Mr. Alexander M. Wilson, and Mr. Sherman C. Kingsley, secretary of the Relief and Aid Society.

ities,[1] the new organization, gained more publicity in its first year of existence than the two societies which it replaced had enjoyed jointly in the six years preceding. One year's contributions to the two societies for their last calendar year totaled $82,946. The United Charities raised a budget of $138,828 its first year—an increase of $55,882.00.

During this period a movement toward federation was also in process in Kansas City, Mo., where a relief society had existed since 1880.[2] It had unfortunately emphasized the fact that it was a business man's organization, to save them both time and money, work-tests in the form of woodyard and laundry being a conspicuous part of the machinery of administration. During the latter half of the nineties, a Friendly Visitors' Class had been organized and relief had been made more adequate, but the need for work of a more constructive kind, such as had been done in a number of cities whose charity had longer been organized, led to the launching in 1899 of an Associated Charities. A differentiation of function and coöperation solved for a time the problem of relationship between the old and new organization. The Associated Charities maintained no relief fund, while the Provident Association turned over to it the investigation of its cases. The divided responsibility inevitable in such a plan led to so much criticism that, in 1903, the Boards of the two organizations decided to work under one management, though the Boards were to retain their identity. Friction, however, arose between the Boards over the question of raising money, and the public was confused by double solicitations. This led to an agreement to have but one joint appeal. Thereupon, the treasurer of the Provident Association each month turned over to the Associated Charities its last month's administrative expenses. This relationship con-

[1] The name was later changed to The Family Welfare Association.
[2] The Kansas City Provident Association.

tinued until 1910, when Kansas City launched its Board of Public Welfare.

Thus we have seen that in spite of any theoretic distinction as to the natural division of work between an association for improving the condition of the poor and a charity organization society, if both exist in the same city,[1] it had become increasingly apparent at the time of which we write, that the two movements separated in their origins by a generation, had gradually approached each other. The trained worker to be found in growing numbers in both types of organization was an important factor in the change. Each was steadfastly working for the discovery of the efficient principles of relief, whether those principles are applied by one agency or another, whether they are held by a group of people who call themselves by one name or by different and possibly historically antagonistic groups.

The Period (1896-1904) in Retrospect

Although there was marked emphasis on the value of trained service, charity organization workers made little advance in technique during the years just surveyed, except possibly in a more intelligent use of material relief.[2] At least there was a growing appreciation of its importance. Some progress there was in understanding and meeting certain types of ever recurrent case problems as presented by the homeless, the deserter and the vagrant. Charity organization societies have never lost

[1] See Edward T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," pp. 354-356 (1904).

[2] Mr. Francis H. McLean stated in 1906, after studying 120 case records of some fifty to sixty of the older societies, that they showed that they must work up to "real investigation." Even in the strongest societies there had been a lamentable lack of efficiency and thoroughness in this direction. In some cases, treatment had started with practically no investigation. In other cases there had been a prolonged investigation of a stereotyped character which led nowhere. In only a few was there clear-cut investigation, not either too long or too short, followed by treatment which was just as clear cut. See "Twenty-five Years and After," *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XIX, p. 1142 (1911).

sight of the individual of flesh and blood to be helped. To apply to his particular needs even the best treatment that years of experience may have taught began, however, to be viewed as "but the A B C of Charity," [1] it being increasingly felt that until the causes of poverty were discovered and removed, the burden would be greater than could be borne.[2] It is not, therefore, surprising that the outstanding characteristic of the period is the emphasis charity organization societies placed on the prevention of poverty, as reflected in the various movements to improve social conditions for which they often served as a matrix. Previous to this time charity organization workers had in practise "paid little attention to the general social conditions which lead to the creation, not so much of pauperism as of bitter, grinding poverty." [3] Striking at the roots of poverty had long been talked about; [4] even as early as the forties and fifties, antedating the charity organization movement, something had been done to awaken the public to the realization of certain social causes of poverty, but nation-wide campaigns for better housing, for the study and prevention of tuberculosis, for the abolition of child labor, in the inauguration of which charity organization societies played so important a part, mark a new epoch.

The dominant note of the new period was a "determination *to seek out and to strike effectively at those organized forces of evil, at those particular causes of de-*

[1] See the Twenty-second Annual Report of the Associated Charities of Washington, D. C.

[2] See especially Albert O. Wright, "The New Philanthropy," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 23d session, pp. 1-12 (1896).

[3] Alexander Johnson, "Organization in the Smaller Cities," *Charities*, Vol. XIV, p. 714 (1905). See also Henry W. Farnam, "Twenty-fifth Anniversary at New Haven," *Charities*, Vol. X, p. 259 (1903).

[4] Many societies had long listed among their objects the study of the causes of pauperism and poverty. As early as 1883 the familiar parable of the Good Samaritan had been used in charity organization circles as illustrating the wisdom of preventive work, it being pointed out that real wisdom required driving the thieves from off the Jericho road rather than pouring on oil and wine after the offense.

pendence and intolerable living conditions which are beyond the control of the individuals whom they injure and whom they too often destroy." [1] The hopeful belief was germinating, as we have seen, that poverty would largely take care of itself "if external conditions were made fairly tolerable, if children were not put at work prematurely, but given the opportunity to play and to grow, if overwork were to cease, if exploitation of employees and purchasers were impossible, if sanitary homes were insured, if congestion of population were controlled, if preventable diseases and accidents were prevented, if physical needs were supplied, if orphans and neglected children and the aged and infirm were promptly placed in suitable foster boarding or cottage homes, if convalescents and such as suffer from chronic ailments were given the opportunity to get well, to work at light and appropriate tasks or to remain without occupation, as their physical condition might require, if savings were safe, the schools provided an education, the police gave protection, the courts administered justice and the charities relief." [2]

Less and less frequently one heard iterated and reiterated "the poor" "will be with us always. It is the utmost we can hope to do to reduce the number to the minimum." [3] More and more the phrase "the abolition of poverty" began to fire people's enthusiasm. More and more it was held "that the problem of charity is only one part of the vast social problem, and is linked with almost every other part of it, so that to do one thing

[1] Edward T. Devine, "The Dominant Note of Modern Philanthropy," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 33d Annual Session, p. 3 (1906). "Nothing has done so much to reveal the fallacy of the well-worn dictum that for large classes of persons economic want is inevitable as the cumulative evidence that of those who seek relief from charitable agencies, many have been brought to that condition by the inadequate wages paid in industries in which they have toiled." Jacob H. Hollander, "Preventive Charity," *The Monthly Register,* Vol. XX, p. 47 (1899).

[2] Edward T. Devine, "Social Forces," *Charities,* Vol. XIX, p. 947 (1907-1908). See also James M. Pullman, "The Development of Charity Organization," *Lend-a-Hand,* Vol. VI, p. 425 (1893).

[3] "Working Women and Their Wages," *The Monthly Register,* Vol. VIII, p. 77 (1887).

well, we are compelled to at least touch upon a hundred other things." [1] An interesting reflection of this change in emphasis is to be seen in the abandoning of the use of the word "deserving" in reference to C. O. S. cases.[2] When one appreciates the difference in mental attitude of the social worker of to-day whose vocabulary still retains this word from that of one who has discarded it, or never acquired it, the significance of the abandonment of the term by charity organizationists can be appreciated. "In nothing," wrote Miss Richmond in 1901 in discussing changes in charitable practices, "does the change seem so marked as in our willingness to coöperate with the poor themselves, and with their neighbors." [3] The change is also reflected in the classification of the causes of poverty which, beginning with the period under review, place increasing emphasis on causes that may be viewed as essentially social.[4]

The reasons for the shift in emphasis are fairly obvious. No person who is interested in social progress can long be content to raise here and there an individual, while tens of thousands of individuals are needlessly being pushed below the poverty line. As charity organization societies began to apply the scientific method to their records, they saw that there were social forces operating on many sides to breed poverty. There is nothing artificial in the growth of the concept of prevention. Case-

[1] Alexander Johnson, "The Great City of To-day," *Charities,* Vol. XII, p. 24 (1904).

[2] The New York Society amended its constitution in 1896, abandoning the use of the word "deserving in reference to cases."

[3] Mary E. Richmond, "Some Methods of Charitable Co-operation," *Charities,* Vol. VII, p. 197 (1901). It may be urged by some in partial justification of the use of the term "deserving" by earlier workers that the type of family that remains in poverty when there is free land for the asking, and the types of poverty found under modern industrial conditions and an absence of available free land are quite different.

[4] At the National Conference of Charities and Correction of 1899, the classification of twenty-two headings adopted by the Conference a decade earlier was revised so as to include two main headings, "Causes within the family" (individual) and "causes outside the family (social).

work, intelligently done, naturally leads on to prevention.[1]

In short, philanthropy had passed through the same stages as the other sciences of which medicine is illustrative—kind impulses, obvious relief, traditional experience, accurate records, comparison of treatment, accepted principles, systematic diagnosis, the abolition of certain diseases, the control of others, hygiene and prevention.

A direct cause of the shift in emphasis was the addition to the leadership of the movement of a group of younger men and women whose faith was kindled by the "heretical doctrine that the depraved man is not the natural man, for in him the natural is suppressed beneath a crushing load of misfortunes, superstitions and ill-fitting social conventions." [2]

It was during the later nineties that the numbers of men and women employed by charitable societies, who considered their work a profession as other men regarded journalism, law, theology or medicine, steadily began to increase.[3] The day had passed when any one was considered capable of readjusting the family affairs of others.[4] The belief seems to have been crystallizing that the

[1] A striking illustration of this truth is The League for Preventive Work, a coöperative organization formed in 1915 by nineteen representative agencies of Boston doing social and medical work among families. The League has done some notable work at interpretation of the facts and experiences gained in social case work by a group of high-grade agencies.

[2] Simon N. Patten, "The New Basis of Civilization," p. 205 (1907).

[3] The remarks here made are not intended to make too sweeping a contrast between those in the ranks of the movement in the eighties and nineties. Many of the pioneers who bore the heat of the day continued to aid the movement most worthily during the period just surveyed.

[4] Among the salaried employees of charitable societies, Mr. Homer Folks found in 1893 three tolerably distinct types which he characterizes in the following language: "The first was the man considerably past middle age, who had outlived his usefulness in any other line, and who, by reason of his unusual goodness, was supposed to be an acceptable alms distributor. In the second type, the great excellency lay in clerical ability; work for a charitable agency was the same as work for a dry-goods firm, a grain warehouse, or a street-cleaning department, except that the wages were somewhat less. The third

success of the charity organization movement depended almost solely upon the possibility of securing enough people for the responsible administrative positions who added to knowledge, wisdom, and who combined with right theory, some experience.

The turning of college men and women to social work as a profession was doubtless due in part at least, to the increasing interest of colleges and universities in social problems.[1] The teaching of Richard T. Ely, then of Johns Hopkins University, had already in the eighties been a big factor in turning the face of Amos G. Warner toward the work of charity organization. Mention should also be made of the influence of Francis G. Peabody at Harvard University, of Frank Sanborn at Cornell University, and S. N. Patten at the University of Pennsylvania.[2]

These younger men and women shared the "growing belief that human society is an organism, under a law of development, and subject to conditions of health and disease which can be ascertained, and, in large measure at least, controlled." [3] The spirit of laissez faire in which the movement had been born had passed. The new knowledge of heredity, holding that acquired character-

type differed from the other two in that the man considered the work a profession, as other men regarded journalism, law, theology or medicine. He entered the work because it was to him the most inviting field of service. At that time those who belonged to the third class commonly had no preparation especially designed to fit them for their work. Amos G. Warner, "American Charities" (Rev. Ed.), pp. 462, 463 (1908). See also Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 179 (1903).

[1] Professionalism in charity may be said to have had its beginnings when a standard of qualifications was set up governing the selection of paid workers.

[2] In the period under review, Dr. Edward T. Devine became head of the New York Charity Organization Society and soon introduced into the philosophy of the movement many of the concepts and ideals of the classroom of Professor Patten. See also Robert W. Bruere, "The Good Samaritan, Incorporated," *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, CXX, p. 836 (1910).

[3] James M. Pullman, "The Churches in Charity Work," Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 25th session, p. 486 (1898).

istics are not inherited, afforded a biologic basis for the "New View," [1] since it means that the great majority of individuals begin life with a greater degree of equality than had ever before been realized. The optimism inherent in this new attitude was further increased by the presence of such vast wealth that could be turned into social and charitable channels, as the past knew nothing of. It began to be realized as never before that nature is generous, not niggardly. The taxing power of the state, and voluntary philanthropy were seen to be able to raise large sums for the general welfare without inflicting hardships on any.

Moreover, a general social consciousness was awakening. Women's clubs throughout the nation as never before were discussing social problems.[2] A marked characteristic of the time was the increased social activities of the churches.[3] It was about this time that the National Consumers' League was organized,[4] "the very first of a series of new movements which are all characterized by their emphasis upon the word prevention—the prevention, that is, of the preventable causes of poverty." [5]

As a result of the general advance in social thinking just noted, the interests of the patrons of charity organization societies had changed. It was but natural that the societies themselves, to catch the public eye, should have reflected the change. The need of meeting the criticism of doing little to remedy the general conditions

[1] The title of a leaflet by Edward T. Devine having wide circulation in charity organization circles, which stressed the importance of environment as a cause of poverty.

[2] Out of 1200 clubs responding to inquiries sent out by the United States Government, 431 said that practical work was being done in one or more of those subjects. Bulletin U. S. Bureau of Labor, July, 1899.

[3] Joseph Lee, "Preventive Work," *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 37 (1901).

[4] Josephine Shaw Lowell, founder of the New York Charity Organization Society, assisted in the formation of the League and became its first President.

[5] Mary E. Richmond, "The Inter-Relation of Social Movements," pamphlet published by the American Unitarian Association, Bulletin No. 17, p. 3.

which produce poverty, spurred more than one society to broaden its work to include these preventive movements. Moreover, as has been pointed out, the field of social work was still relatively undifferentiated. These newer movements would have waited long in many communities, had they not been taken under the fostering care of the local charity organization society, either as a part of its own immediate work or as a separate association whose personnel was largely identified with the local society.

Although the period just reviewed was marked by great interest in such preventive movements as housing and public health, there were not lacking those who sounded a note of warning against an expansion that might draw upon the energy needed for good social case work. This "special field" of charity organization societies, it was pointed out, "calls for hard and persistent effort in lines that are easily slighted, and a society's lapse from the standard is not vindicated by its assumption of other functions." [1] It is the improvement in the technique of the day's work that characterizes the next stage of the history of the movement. It should not, however, be inferred thereby that interest in preventive work by any means ceased or even lessened with the close of the period just surveyed. Other hands were ready to take hold. The field of social work had become the differentiated and specialized one of to-day.

[1] D. I. G., "Needy Families in Their Homes," *Charities,* Vol. IX, p. 19 (1902).

CHAPTER IX

THE NATIONALIZATION OF THE MOVEMENT

[1905-1921]

By 1905 the movement for organizing charity in America stood upon the threshold of a national phase of development. Growth up to this time had been more or less spasmodic. No one can, however, study the rise and earlier development of the movement without appreciating the extent and power of the missionary spirit of its leaders.[1] Their efforts, however, were largely unorganized until the Charities Publication Committee of the Charity Organization Society of the city of New York, initiated in 1905 a Field Department of *Charities and the Commons,* through which the charity organization societies of the country could coöperate in a national plan for spreading the principles and methods of charity organization.

This step was not taken suddenly. As early as 1897 it had been pointed out in several quarters that if a charity organizationist had a good thing, he should intelligently offer it to others, that his "principles" should not be left to spontaneous propagation but should consistently be advanced until every city and town was in harmonious coöperation, using methods as uniform as the different local conditions would permit. In the words of the Committee on the Organization of Charity, reporting at the National Conference of Charities and Correction that

[1] The journey of Dr. Daniel C. Gilman and Mr. John M. Glenn of Baltimore, and of Mr. Robert Treat Paine, Jr., of Boston, to New Orleans in 1897 to aid in the launching of a new society is illustrative.

year, the time was "ripe for an organized effort to plant the approved modern methods of charitable administration, public, private and personal, throughout the entire country." "Such a missionary movement should be pushed by an organized executive force dedicated to that purpose," the report continued.[1] Six years later at the National Conference of Charities and Correction held at Atlanta, Georgia (1903), it had been clearly recognized that the question as to "whether the extension of systematic and intelligent methods of public and private charitable administration should be by design or left to mere accident," was "a problem soon to be faced and settled."[2] A beginning of the solution of this problem was made in 1905 with the establishment of the Field Department, to which reference has just been made.[3]

The missionary field before the new department was large. The vast majority of existent societies were to be found along the northern half of the Atlantic seaboard. South of the Great Lakes to the Mason and Dixon Line, societies were to be found in less numbers, but beyond to the Pacific and below to the Gulf there were only a few stragglers. Furthermore, there were, in all sections, cities which, though recently but towns, had many of the social problems of the older cities without realizing their significance. Their development in material wealth had outrun their development in social legislation and in institutions of culture. There was also a host of smaller communities of 60,000, and under, in which charity was still chaotic and unorganized. In all, there were approximately 360 communities with population ranging from 10,000 to 60,000, and 415 additional incorporated places with a population between 5,000 and 60,000, making a

[1] Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, 24th session, p. 142 (1897).

[2] Alfred O. Crozier, "The Expansion of Organized Charity," *Charities*, Vol. X, p. 575 (1903).

[3] In 1891 the London Society had formed a provincial sub-committee with an annual conference which aimed to serve the same purpose as the Field Department referred to above.

total of 775 cities and towns, with but 79 societies for organizing charity among them.[1] Charity organization had hitherto been most successful in the great cities, partly because the need for it was less in smaller places or at least less obvious, but largely because it was less difficult to secure the services of an experienced worker and support of the work in the larger and wealthier centers of population.

Not many years before the period under discussion, it was generally believed that it was hardly desirable to create a charity organization society in a community with less than 40,000 inhabitants. At the time of the inauguration of the missionary movement in 1905, the requisite sized unit of population was believed to be 20,000, while to-day it is 5,000 or even less. Hardly any community is now considered too small to organize its charitable resources even when to do so it becomes necessary to share with another community or with a whole county the services of a paid professional worker.

Even in the larger centers the field of work before the new department was considerable. On the basis of the Census of 1910 there were still 45 cities with populations of 25,000 to 100,000, either without societies or with mere shells of organizations. Many existing societies were organized wrongly [2] and demanded aid in reorganization, some societies were facing crises and needed support, while still other societies required aid in improving their standards of work [3] or in developing

[1] A. W. McDougal, "How Should the Treatment of Needy Families be Organized in Cities of Less than Sixty Thousand Inhabitants?" *Charities*, Vol. IX, p. 333 (1902).

[2] There still persisted in many places a very old and utterly vicious form of organization based upon the division of a town into districts and the selection of one or more ladies to make volunteer investigations and carry out all the family treatment required. Francis H. McLean, "Organized Charity," *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XXI, p. 312 (1908).

[3] As recently as 1907 the Associated Charities of Knoxville had no competent person for general secretary, investigating being done by a police matron and police officer in plain clothes. Even more recently the local society of a city in the northwest had been manned by an

their community programs. High grade family work rests ultimately upon an educated public opinion, a matter of comparatively slow growth in all technical fields.

One of the first services undertaken by the Field Department was the establishment of an Exchange Bureau, a clearing house for the interchange of all blanks and literature issued by the constituent members.[1]

In 1907 the Field Department began issuing a monthly bulletin as a special means of communication among the various societies throughout the country. Each issue contained articles by the national leaders in the movement on such technical questions as "interviewing," "the use of sources of information" and the "art of case recording." [2]

Charity Organization Extension

Besides continuing to publish studies on the technique of case work and to act as a clearing house of information among societies already in existence, the Field Department took steps in 1907 to carry out one of its original purposes by engaging a field secretary [3] to aid com-

ex-policeman, who spurned the idea that there was anything he could learn of the technique of case work, while in a southern city of some prominence the work was in charge of an ex-school teacher who had spent many years in the service and who, though respected in the community, proved the chief obstacle to most of the progressive movements in her city. In many places the force of trained workers was pitifully inadequate.

[1] At the National Conference of Charities and Correction held at Portland, Oregon, in 1905, the general secretaries of some of the charity organization societies had agreed to exchange form letters and printed matter each month through some central agency. This developed into the Exchange Bureau.

[2] The plan was proposed at the National Conference of Charities and Correction of 1907. As one of the main purposes of the bulletin was the discussion of technical problems connected with professional work of charity organization societies, the bulletins were circulated among charity organization societies only. At the beginning there were but sixteen cooperating societies and the bulletins were multigraphed. By 1908 the number of coöperating societies had increased and the bulletins were printed but not published.

[3] Mr. Francis H. McLean, who had been Associate Editor of the Field Department of the *Survey* since 1906, when he was Superintendent

munities wishing to launch charity organization societies and to help out of its difficulties any society that had wandered from the path of scientific charity. The need for this work is attested by the fact that the field secretary was soon overwhelmed with opportunities for usefulness.[1] Between December, 1907, and December, 1909, he visited thirty-nine cities, in sixteen of which organization or reorganization was fully accomplished by the latter date. This does not include the organizing work aided by correspondence and by the visits of the associate field secretary in fifteen places. In nearly every instance these thirty-one cities and towns were induced to employ a trained secretary and often trebled their original budget.

Under the Field Department in 1909 a system of Forwarding Centers was established, through which societies might secure investigation in places of over 5,000 in which there were no charity organization societies. Later by consent of the Forwarding Centers themselves, the service was extended to include any place with a post-office within the territory mentioned.

The Pittsburgh Associated Charities

Among the thirty-one communities just mentioned, Pittsburgh deserves special mention, not merely because it was the last of the metropolitan cities to found a charity organization society, but because it was in connection with it, that a Central Council of Social Agencies, a plan for correlating the activities of all the agencies of a city, was first tried.

Unlike all the older cities which had had their general

of the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities. At the National Conference of Charities and Correction of that year, he had outlined a plan of field work calling for the services of a traveling secretary. During the next twelve months he had devoted his spare hours to correspondence with cities seeking advice about the organization or reorganization of their local charitable work.

[1] No visits were paid without invitation from those locally interested.

family welfare societies long before the present host of special social agencies came into existence, 1908 found Pittsburgh with almost all these activities but with no charity organization society. The Associated Charities of Pittsburgh, as it was called, began literally as an association of charities. Within approximately a year's time of its founding, forty-four of the leading social agencies of the city had joined, each contributing ten dollars or more, and appointing a delegate to a Central Council of Social Agencies.

In organizing its district plan of work the Pittsburgh association followed the Chicago idea which had proven so successful in developing able leaders in the various districts.[1] In addition to the strong district committee of the Ohio Valley District, there were soon in operation other conferences which met weekly. In spite of the fact that the Pittsburgh society proceeded slowly in laying its plans, that it stood ready to take its part in the encouragement of broad social reforms and to become the coördinating servant of the social forces of the community; in spite of the fact that the organization was put into the hands of social workers who had already won their spurs in other communities, and who had in the beginning of their work made much progress in registration work and in the development of coöperation,[2] the work in Pittsburgh was early destined to a set-back from which the society needed several years to recover.[3] Many of the older social agencies of the city had viewed the movement for an Associated Charities with favor, some, however, with disfavor. The forces of opposition which for ten years prevented the organization of such a society, reas-

[1] In Chicago each district manages its own affairs except finances. There is, however, a conference of districts under a general district secretary.

[2] By March, 1909, nineteen organizations, including among them the most important agencies in the city, were regularly reporting to the Registration Bureau.

[3] See Anon., "Charles F. Weller Goes to Pittsburgh," *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XX, p. 393 (1908).

serted themselves once it was started and so made thorough going coöperation difficult. Part of the temporary set-back seems to have been due also to the form of organization of the Associated Charities. So much emphasis was placed on the fact that the new association was a clearing-house for the 120 members who constituted the Central Council (which Council in turn named ten of the twenty-one trustees of the Associated Charities) that the community viewed it more in the nature of a federation of charities than a society for organizing charity. Realizing that its purpose was the latter, the Associated Charities in 1912 amended its Constitution. Among other changes, the Central Council was deprived of the right of naming ten trustees, and the Associated Charities became an independent member of the Central Council. Standing more squarely on its own feet it was subsequently able to develop a coöperation based on efficient case-work that compared favorably with that obtaining in many communities with charity organization societies of long standing. Thus by slow but steady efforts the Associated Charities brought into a great city of 600,000 the ideals of thorough family case-work without which the work of all social agencies in the city had been handicapped.[1]

The Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation

The results achieved by the publication of Field Department Bulletins and by the field secretary and his assistant were so valuable and far-reaching that in October, 1909, the Russell Sage Foundation established a Charity Organization Department[2] devoted to extension work and kindred endeavors. The issuance of

[1] See A. B. Fox, "Focussing the Lines of Social Contact," *The Survey*, Vol. XXV, p. 1036 (1911).

[2] Miss Mary E. Richmond became Director of the Department, which position she still occupies. In the Department Mr. Francis H. McLean and Miss Margaret F. Byington retained their old official titles and duties of Field and Assistant Field Secretary respectively.

the Field Department Bulletins and the work in the field just described, therewith passed from the control of *Charities and the Commons* to the new department of the Russell Sage Foundation, which assumed the further task of endeavoring to improve the work of persons already in the harness by supplying systematic family case-work instruction in some of the schools of social work. This purpose took more definite shape in 1910 by the establishment of a month's Charity Organization Institute, which meets annually. Its object is to meet the problem of the charity organization worker who is already at work, but who seeks further opportunity for training.[1]

That a more logical organization for carrying on the extension activities than the Russell Sage Foundation, would be an association composed of all societies for organizing charity was in the minds of a number of charity organization secretaries at the time that the Field Department of *Charities and the Commons* transferred its duties to the Russell Sage Foundation. The time, however, did not seem ripe for launching such a new nation-wide association. However, at the National Conference of Charities and Correction of that year (1909) the twenty-three charity organization societies which had been in the habit of exchanging forms monthly, selected a committee to consider the matter, which reported at the National Conference the year following, when a temporary organization was effected.[2] A year later (1911) it was decided that the time had arrived for the establishment of a permanent organization among the one hundred and twenty-nine societies of the country. A division of work and plan of coöperation was adopted by the new National Association of Societies for Organizing Charity (with sixty Charity Organization Societies as

[1] For several years the institute, now the Institute of Family Social Work, was held under the auspices of the New York School of Philanthropy. In 1914 this relationship, which had been but nominal, was severed.

[2] It was known as the National Association of Societies for Organizing Charity. Frederic Almy became Secretary.

charter members) and the Charity Organization Department whereby the former assumed the duties of extension work and the latter retained the tasks of research work based on case studies, the maintenance of a technical journal for the use of established societies and a short normal course for the further training of charity organization workers. Thus, although many movements much less well known than that of charity organization have been nationalized after a few years' growth, it was over three decades after the first charity organization society was founded that the movement achieved a truly national basis.

That the need of the new association was great is attested by the fact that during its first eight months of existence no less than thirty-two cities had been definitely assisted in organization and twenty-nine were on the way. The association soon marked out a program of organization as fast as possible, in cities of 10,000 or over (there were about 500 alone of 10,000 population), and experimental organization in cities of less than 10,000, all expansion to be regulated by adequately holding on to the ground already gained. As it was soon demonstrated that cities of 10,000 are able to pay for the full time of a trained worker, the field still uncultivated offered a challenge to any movement hoping to become truly national. That the time, moreover, was opportune for charity organization societies collectively to accept the obligation to carry on extension work is borne out by the fact that in three years time the Association included in its membership 142 societies in 140 cities scattered throughout 33 states in the United States and three provinces in Canada. This is all the more remarkable when it is recalled that charity organization membership in the Association was based on compliance with the four following stipulations: (1) A paid agent or secretary on full time (this provision does not apply to cities with a population of less than 10,000). (2) The use of indi-

vidual records and the exchange of information. (3) Signing the rules governing the issuance of transportation by charity societies and public officials as promulgated by the National Conference of Charities and Correction.[1] (4) An agreement to answer inquiries sent to it by societies for organizing charity in other cities.

Since its organization the Association with changing titles[2] but the same spirit has carried on steadily its work of organization and reorganization of societies for family social work throughout the country and in the formation of Central Councils of Social Agencies, whereby all the agencies of a city correlate their activities and render their efforts more effective. Staff members of the Association also make consultation visits to organization members which may have problems they wish to discuss on the spot. Certain phases of the Association's work is carried on by committees of which the following are illustrative: Committee on Salary Standards, the Committee on Recruiting and Training New Workers, and the Committee on Marriage Laws and Their Administration in the several states. In 1919 the Association, which then had 180 members,[3] launched the magazine *The Family,* as the national organ of the movement.

[1] An agreement whereby signers contract not to ship applicants for relief from one city to another without investigation.

[2] From the National Association of Societies for Organizing Charity it became the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity in order to include Canadian members; then American Association for Organizing Charity in the interest of brevity and finally the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work as more descriptive of its true function.

[3] These 180 societies met the following minimum requirements for eligibility to membership:

(1) A paid worker on full time.
(2) Individual case records.
(3) Signing of the Transportation Code.
(4) Agreement to answer inquiries and make investigations for Associated Charities in other cities.
(5) A membership open to all in the community.

There were (Jan., 1920) 300 societies in this country and 250 in foreign countries that met the following minimum standards:

(1) A paid worker on full time (applying only to cities of over 10,000 population). (2) Signing of the Transportation Code. (3) Agreement to answer inquiries from out-of-town agencies.

The Beginnings of the Movement for Organizing Charity in the South

The first three years' work of the Field Secretary of the Field Department, previously mentioned, were given to the South. The poverty of the South incident to the Civil War, followed by the rapid industrial strides that have characterized this section since the nineties, had not proven conducive to the development of a highly trained grade of professional social service. The South had by no means been uninterested in social movements prior to the advent of the charity organization movement. The child labor movement, the educational movement, and in some communities the anti-tuberculosis movement had preceded. Yet all these causes undoubtedly suffered because outside of the interested groups "there were not many inevitable points of contact beyond the propaganda work itself where the uninterested were being forced to realize the individual results of social forces." [1]

The meeting of the National Conference of Charities and Correction in Atlanta in 1903, however, marked the beginning of a social awakening.[2] To-day movements for social welfare have caught the popular imagination to a

[1] Francis H. McLean, "Memphis To-day," *The Survey,* Vol. XXX, p. 565 (1913).

[2] In 1897 a special meeting of the National Conference of Charities and Correction was held in New Orleans which had a great local influence. In the same year a charity organization society was formed in the city. Several leaders in the movement from Boston and Baltimore aided in its launching. It was founded on the principle of no relief from its own funds except in case of emergency. This society has never played any influential rôle in the development of the movement throughout the South. Though there are to-day a number of organizations in the South with the titles of Associated Charities or United Charities, which date their origin in the nineties and in some instances to the eighties, they were, prior to 1905, charity organization societies largely in name only.

remarkable extent in many southern communities.[1] This growing social interest gave birth, in 1912, to the Southern Sociological Congress, which meets annually to discuss, among other things, the problems of child welfare, public health, courts and prisons, charity organization, race relations and the Church and social service.[2] In 1916 the first of the proposed extension conferences of the Congress was held in Columbia, S. C. By July of this same year only two southern states, Mississippi and Georgia were without their state conferences of Charities and Correction.

The Atlanta Associated Charities

This society merits special mention, since it was the pioneer of that growing number of societies in the South founded on "the new view of charity"—and employing the methods of the best of the societies in the North. The immediate occasion for its organization, in 1905, recalls the conditions and circumstances which gave birth a generation earlier to the pioneer societies of the North. An ice-storm of great severity paralyzing business for days resulted in an immense amount of suffering among the poor. The churches of the city and the existing charitable organizations were soon swamped by numberless calls for help. The newspapers made much of the situation. The citizens responded promptly and generously. Subscriptions were opened in numerous places and in a short time a large amount of money was col-

[1] As in the North, these social movements have in many instances been launched by newly founded societies for organizing charity as branches of their work. In other cases the connection has been unofficial, the same group of interested persons standing back of each organization.

[2] It was felt that there is a place for the Congress in addition to the National Conference of Charities and Correction, not because the problems of the South were peculiar but because a southern Congress would be more largely attended by Southern peoples interested than would the National Conference of Charities and Correction, except when that body met in a southern city.

lected. With the return of normal times it became apparent to all that in handling the emergency there had been no method, no organization. Each church and each society had acted practically independently of all others, and in many cases people in great need had gone unhelped, while in many others, applicants had received ten times as much food, fuel or clothing as they had really required, and had sold the surplus, using the money for whiskey or morphine. Several public-spirited citizens acquainted with the methods of charity organization were instrumental in launching, shortly thereafter, the Associated Charities. Atlanta was districted under paid secretaries, case conferences were organized and friendly visitors utilized. The new organization brought order out of chaos, and apparently from the beginning has enjoyed both the coöperation of the older charitable organizations and the confidence of the public. One element of success in gaining the good will of social agencies already in existence was a rigid adherence to the rule of furnishing no material relief from its own funds and so competing with none.[1] All money for relief was procured from other agencies or by individual subscriptions solicited especially for the respective cases as they arose.[2] Beside the work with families in distress, the new association soon made itself felt in the community at large. It started the local playground work, established a dispensary for the treatment of the poor suffering from tuberculosis, organized a "committee on physical welfare

[1] Annual Report, Associated Charities of Atlanta, p. 10 (1906). As far as the author is aware this is the last society for organizing charity launched on a platform of no relief fund of any kind.

[2] It soon became apparent that large sums would have to be raised. This led to the creation of a relief fund maintained separately from the General Fund. The deficit of the special fund grew until it was removed by transfers from the General Fund. Thus the "case by case" method finally evolved into the existence of a relief fund to which people contributed with no special case in view. As the evolution was gradual it did not arouse opposition at just the time when the new organization was working for the coöperation of the other social agencies of the city.

of school children" composed of representatives from practically all of the civic and philanthropic organizations of the city and conducted a class for the study of social problems.

The coöperation which the society gained not only with other agencies but with the newspapers of the city, was soon second to none in the country.[1] This was due apparently not alone to the broad community program for which the society stood, but also to education of the public through quiet, sympathetic, thorough case-work.[2]

The awakening to the need of more efficient methods of charity soon spread to other parts of the South. In Richmond, Virginia, the belief was expressed that the chief need of the community in the field of social service was the securing of an adequately paid social worker "familiar with modern methods of charitable work in other cities, and capable of serving as a leader and organizer for the rapidly growing philanthropic activities of the city."[3] The Associated Charities of Raleigh, organized in 1903, "to suppress street begging, to decrease uninformed almsgiving at the house doors, and to gather all general relief work of the community into a center of coöperative, intelligent administration,"[4] was beginning, by 1905, to give evidence of an increasingly intelligent interest in the problems of the poor and a promising sense of responsibility for the development of wise charitable work. The year 1906 saw the launching of societies for organizing charity in Richmond and in San Antonio, Texas. The year following Frankfort Ky., Augusta, Ga., Fort Worth, Tex., and Asheville, N. C.,

[1] This is evidenced by the tone of the public press and the absence of scare headline articles either exploiting the poverty of some so-called poor family or attacking "organized charity."

[2] This was not limited to Atlanta. The General Secretary was a member of the Field Department Committee of *Charities and The Commons*. He gave freely of his time to spread the gospel of charity organization to surrounding towns in the state.

[3] Charles F. Weller, "Charity and Social Development in Two Southern Cities," *Charities*, Vol. XIII, p. 467 (1905).

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 467.

were added to the list of southern cities with charity organization societies. The year 1909 witnessed the extension of the movement to no less than six additional Southern cities.[1]

The Social Awakening in Savannah

In 1909 the National Tuberculosis Exhibit was brought to Savannah. At the same time an active group of women, under the name of the "Committee on Charities and Health," was organized to consider the best way of fighting the great white plague. It became increasingly apparent to this committee that tuberculosis is but one aspect of a large community problem which can be effectively met only by organized effort. Mr. Francis H. McLean, Field Secretary of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, came to Savannah at the request of the Committee and made several public addresses, by which the sympathy of business men, clergy and members of charitable organizations was enlisted. Through the courtesy of the Mayor and City Council, an office was obtained in the City Hall, the services of a trained social worker with twelve years' experience were secured and the Associated Charities of Savannah was launched on a firm basis. Beside the work with individuals and families in distress in which the cooperation of a large group of societies of long standing was gradually secured, the new society early played an active part in the local campaign against tuberculosis, organizing a committee to study the prevention, relief and cure of the scourge, and to build a hospital for advanced cases. Believing one of its duties to be helping the public "to understand and practice sane, sympathetic and enlightened charity," the secretary of the society spoke before many groups in the community, including the colored people in the hope of later organizing a special committee

[1] Staunton, Va.; Lynchburg, Va.; Wheeling, W. Va.; Savannah, Ga.; Columbus, Ga., and Pensacola, Fla.

for work with negroes,[1] conducted a "case conference" in which family problems were selected for discussion because of their educational value, and instituted a training class for social workers primarily designed for those working for the Associated Charities.

The Birmingham Society

During 1910 the movement for organizing charity gained a foothold in three other important southern cities, Birmingham, Ala., Jacksonville, Fla., and Charlotte, N. C. Each illustrated the need of a charity organization society felt by a community awaking to its social responsibilities. In Birmingham the local Children's Aid Society, realizing the value of greater coöperation among the social agencies of the city,[2] and believing that this could best be effected through the activities of an efficient charity organization society, had succeeded the year previous in having the Field Secretary of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation address a number of public-spirited citizens of Birmingham. After a delay of almost a year, as the time did not seem propitious for launching the new organization, and a second visit from the Field Secretary, the Associated Charities of Birmingham was organized.

Five days after the new society had opened its doors a disaster in the mines of the Palos Coal & Coke Company at Palos, Alabama, occurred, and eighty-nine lives were lost. Such calamities need the benefits of trained leadership and the methods which are known not only to preserve the spirit of independence in those who have

[1] The feeling in Savannah and elsewhere in the South seemed to be to care for the needy white families first and gradually extend the work to the colored. This was sometimes justified by the low standards of living generally obtaining among the latter.

[2] There was already a relief society of long years' standing parading as a charity organization society. Because of its failure to secure cooperation with the social agencies of the city, it often happened that the same person was found to be receiving aid from four or five different organizations.

suffered crushing losses but also to safeguard the money contributed. In this instance the Associated Charities was appealed to with the result that the Secretary of the society, a man with years of experience in the field, gave his services, formulating a pension plan of distribution of the fund raised by public subscription based on two months' constant association with the proposed beneficiaries of the fund.

Beside its customary work for families and individuals in need the new society soon began to play an important rôle in the field of public health. Its activities resulted in the establishment of the Committee for the Study and Prevention of Infant Mortality, launched under a separate Board of Directors. At the same time the new society joined in an effective campaign against tuberculosis [1] which soon crystallized in the formation of the Anti-Tuberculosis Association of Jefferson County, of which the General Secretary of the Associated Charities became secretary.

The Jacksonville Society

The second important foothold in the South gained during 1910 was in Jacksonville, Florida. During the winter of 1908-09 the Social Science Class of the Women's Club of Jacksonville, a wide-awake organization of public-spirited women, had studied contemporaneous methods of dealing with dependency and made a comprehensive survey of local conditions. Investigation disclosed the fact that Jacksonville had no collected data, and that in dealing with dependents there was much duplication of effort, indiscriminate giving and haphazard, planless charity.

To remedy the situation the club decided to arouse public opinion and found a charity organization society. In order that the methods to be adopted by the proposed

[1] In 1907 the State Medical Association had induced the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis to send to Birmingham, Mobile and Alabama its Tuberculosis Exhibit.

society should be in harmony with the best thought of the day, the Field Secretary of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation conferred in person on a plan of procedure. It was decided to postpone the formation of a charity organization society, but to form a Charity Council, composed of the representatives of the various philanthropic agencies of the city, which met monthly to discuss kindred problems. Before the year was out this council called a conference which resulted in the launching of a charity organization society. In addition to its work with families in distress, the new society almost immediately began a campaign against tuberculosis. With the aid of several organizations of the city, it employed a visiting nurse for all tubercular cases. The society also established as a demonstration a small camp near the city for men suffering with tuberculosis. Among its other activities were the formation of an effective legal aid committee, composed of local public-spirited attorneys, and the operation of a travelers' aid department. It was not long before it also helped to launch, through its knowledge of the histories of hundreds of families in the city, medical inspection of schools and two industrial schools. Through the activity of the Charity Council, which had fostered it, the new society enjoyed from the start hearty support from other social agencies, the city government and the public. The three members of the relief committee of the City Council became members of the board of directors of the Associated Charities, though not officially connected with it. As a result, the new society made all investigations for public outdoor relief for the city, with a saving of approximately $2,000 a year. Through excellent coöperation with the city police administration, street begging was greatly lessened. Chronic cases of begging were sent to the workhouse. Through the confidence already gained, the Associated Charities found it possible to persuade the Mayor of

the city to refuse a permit for the solicitation of funds for a rescue home the leaders of which were soon proven to be a group of self-seekers. Probably the greatest contribution of the Associated Charities came as standard bearer of the newer methods of social case work in the community. Fortnightly, a committee composed of individuals representing societies, churches and clubs interested in social welfare, met to consider some of the more difficult problems confronting the society in its daily work, and to learn of the best methods of work tried elsewhere, in dealing with both individual and community problems.

The Charlotte, N. C., Society

The third Southern city mentioned above as joining the ranks of charity organization cities in 1910 was Charlotte, N. C. Its origin repeats an old story—a town so overrun with beggars that something had to be done. Its form of organization illustrates how rapidly the charity organization movement was becoming truly national. In 1909 a public meeting had been called under the auspices of the ministers of the city. One of their number had previously communicated with the Richmond and Atlanta societies. Permeated with the ideals of charity organization, he was able to influence the meeting to take steps looking toward establishing a charity organization society instead of a relief society. An Associated Charities was begun soon thereafter with a local public-spirited physician as secretary on part time. This proved unsatisfactory, as the secretary found it impossible to devote the time needed for the work. In 1910 a union meeting of all the churches was again called, the field secretary of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation giving the principal address. A short time thereafter the Associated Charities of Charlotte was revived and a new full-time trained secretary was engaged. Moral and financial support were immediately

forthcoming for the new work. The Associated Charities found cordial coöperation among all the philanthropic agencies of the city. It investigated for all of those willing to supply assistance whenever asked for by the Associated Charities. The city of Charlotte gave no outdoor relief, but referred applicants to the Associated Charities.[1] As the local Anti-Tuberculosis Association was inactive, the Associated Charities added to its other duties a campaign against this source of poverty, appointing an active committee for this work. As the problem of the homeless man was particularly acute in Charlotte, the new society early addressed itself to this problem, believing that Charlotte could and would have as many homeless men as it cared to support. Its belief, based on almost universal experience, was justified. When homeless men were almost always referred to the Associated Charities, the chief of police rendering great assistance by keeping this class and all beggars off the streets, the problem was reduced to a minimum.

The Memphis Society

Reference to the new movement in the South would not be complete without mention of the remarkable social development of Memphis, the commercial center of its section of the country. In 1907 there was only one modern social agency in the city, a playground association. By 1913 a civic awakening had provided the city with a progressive juvenile court, an efficient Department of Health, which was receiving an appropriation of approximately 10% of the total income of the city, and an Associated Charities launched two years previous, which had had a remarkable growth increasing its budget of $12,000 for the first year to

[1] Later the city council appropriated $1500 a year for relief purposes but agreed to furnish no relief unless indorsed by the Associated Charities.

$33,000 for the second.[1] The new society was unique in consolidating the relief-giving, the dispensary service and the visiting nursing of the city into one organization, in the belief that these three divisions of work "more than any other agencies must work together in solving the problems of dependent families."[2] It organized a baby welfare department with city aid. There were also established in the same way dispensaries for eye, ear, nose, throat· tuberculosis, orthopedic, nerve, mental and skin disease service. Campaigns suggested by the Associated Charities and conducted by the bachelors of the city, resulted in the establishment of a new Municipal Children's Hospital and in a Fresh Air Camp for run-down and convalescent children and their mothers. In 1914 the Associated Charities aided in the creation of the Memphis Neighborhood Nursery Association and in the establishment of a Department of Public Recreation by the city of Memphis, for which a budget of $12,000 was appropriated for the first year's work.[3]

When one considers the size of the negro problem in the South, and when one appreciates the fact that charity organization is a plant of slow growth, one is not surprised to learn that the problem of family rehabilitation among negroes except in a few places such as Memphis has remained largely untouched.[4] During the period

[1] There had preceded a United Charities which was such only in name. Its budget had been $2,400 a year.

[2] Third Annual Report, Associated Charities of Memphis, p. 2 (1913-1914).

[3] The committee appointed by the Mayor to make a survey and report on the need for this work had as its Vice-Chairman, the President of the Associated Charities, and as its Secretary, the Secretary of the Associated Charities.

[4] This does not mean that nothing was done for negro cases. In but few places, however, were they found to apply to the local charity organization society, and those who did usually needed hospital treatment. Opinion seemed divided as to the question of using colored workers for colored cases, with the weight of opinion in favor of such. The work for negroes was most fully developed in Memphis, where the Associated Charities operated a negro auxiliary known as the Colored Federated Charities. This has a board of negro directors and is practically a department of the Associated Charities with its own

under review the feeling seemed to have been fairly general that it was wiser to concentrate on the problem of poverty among the whites, leaving that among the colored for the future. That the negro problem is largely a poverty problem, has only recently begun to be realized.[1]

Thus within less than a decade did the movement for organizing charity gain a firm hold in a score of cities of the "new South." Since then progress has been assured. Old territory has been held and new gained. The number of active and efficient societies with paid workers has greatly increased. There has also developed a community of interest among the charity organization societies of the seven southeastern states that augurs well for the future. This has been particularly true in handling the problem of charitable transportation, a problem that has been acute in the South. Not only among themselves do the charity organization societies of the South live up to the national transportation agreement, but they have been instrumental in getting a number of southern cities to adopt ordinances, obligating themselves to fulfill the terms of the transportation agreement in the issuance of charity transportation.

Growth in West

Although the movement had gained a foothold in several of the larger cities across the Mississippi River two decades earlier, up to the beginning of the years here surveyed the development had been slow and uneven. In the main, the societies whose origins antedated 1905 were to be found in Iowa, Missouri, Colorado and California. With the exception of Minneapolis, St.

committees and workers. The negroes in two years raised $2,500 among 116 subscribers, thus meeting one-fourth of the cost of operating the negro department.

[1] See L. H. Hammond, "In Black and White," 244 pp. (1914).

Louis, Kansas City (Mo.), Denver, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco and Los Angeles, the societies were to be found in the smaller cities and towns. Of the thirty odd societies one could count on one hand the number of places in this vast territory where the standards of work done approximated the best of the country at large. Typical of this group was the Minneapolis Society, which since 1884 had enjoyed almost uninterrupted progress. Through its departments of relief and aid, visiting nursing, anti-tuberculosis, legal aid, visiting housekeeping, employment, charities information, confidential exchange, Red Cross, education, and social welfare promotion, it was at this time, not only aiding the poor of Minneapolis in a constructive way, but also attacking in farsighted fashion community problems as well. The majority of societies during at least the first half of the period covered by this chapter (1905-1921) had either no grip on the local situation, or were charity organization societies in name only. On the Pacific Coast the movement had struck its roots even less deep. Of but one society could it be said during the earlier years of the period that it enjoyed the support of a strong board of directors. The San Francisco Society, because of its services subsequent to the earthquake and fire in 1906, won a place for itself in the community. The leading men in the various coast cities with this exception had not yet become identified with charity organization. The financial support everywhere was inadequate. Societies were still using untrained workers.

The relatively slow spread of the movement throughout the West was to be expected. Here free land was most accessible. Being a newer section of the country, social problems were naturally later in developing.[1] It took a longer time to appreciate the need for a vigorous and intelligent grappling with the

[1] It should be recalled that during the period under review the population of some western cities doubled and even tripled.

problem of the neglected family in its home. Moreover, in certain sections of the West people were just making their money. Whatever contributions they made to charity came out of their tills and not from bank accounts. Then again the movement had been introduced into some localities largely through imitation of development elsewhere. Such societies were destined to remain for some time largely paper organizations. Usually progress was held back for just the opposite reason. Western communities generally were individualistic and preferred to do things their own way, ignoring often the benefits of the experience of older communities.

In nothing is the vitality of the movement better illustrated than in the changes which have taken place in the West in the last decade. Although in some places progress has still been slow and the history of individual societies may aptly be described as checkered, nevertheless, family welfare agencies have in the main found real places for themselves. Some of the older societies have entered a period of renewed youth which promises well for the future. The work in one place which had lagged, under a trained worker made a name for itself. Still another society which had lost the confidence of a considerable proportion of the public-spirited citizens of its own community and was out of touch with the other societies and the National Conference of Charities and Correction has regained its place of usefulness, while the work in still other places has gone quietly but steadily forward.

According to the directory of Charity Organization Societies, there were in December, 1912, 154 organizations in the United States. Of these only fifteen (of which seven were members of the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity) were in the Southwest. Considering the sparseness of population in much of this territory, this statement is not so surprising. Nevertheless, the territory did offer an important field for the

extension of charity organization principles. In 1912-13 the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity entered this magically changing section of the country, when a society was organized at Texarkana, Arkansas. Since then the movement has made steady gains in the Southwest.

Like progress has been made in the great Northwest. In 1911 the first Northwestern Conference of Charities and Correction [1] met at Seattle. The spirit of "up-and-doingness" and prevention permeated the sessions. The opening meeting was devoted to a discussion of provision for the social future, forestalling the slums of older communities. Because the local charity organization society and local public-spirited citizens wanted the best council not only for themselves but for the whole Pacific Northwest on the social problems they were facing incident to the immigration they expected with the opening of the Panama Canal, they began at the same time successfully to lay plans to bring the National Conference of Charities and Correction to Seattle in 1913. Inevitably the conference reaches a larger percentage of people from the section of the country in which it meets than from other sections. Its influence was therefore considerable in extending and strengthening the movement for better family case work in the north Pacific states. On the other hand, it should not be overlooked that "the progressive spirit of the rapid social advance on the Pacific Coast was remarked on every hand by Eastern delegates to the conference." [2]

In the spread of charity organization westward it is not surprising to note certain marked tendencies that have accompanied the development. One finds a desire to blaze new trails, due to the pioneer spirit. Communities like to do things their own way even when viewed as "heterodox." In the West, the relation between public

[1] Since called the Social Service Conference for the Pacific Northwest.

[2] Roger W. Baldwin, "The National Conference at Seattle," *The Survey*, Vol. XXX, p. 590 (1913).

outdoor relief officials and charity organization societies has on the whole been more cordial than in the East.[1] A comparative freedom in government and a confident resort to governmental agencies instead of private societies characterizes the social development of the West. This has gone so far in places that there has been the danger of a too great readiness to leave the whole social development in the hands of public authorities, forgetting, as has been well said, that "without the experimentation of private agencies and their education of public opinion to better standards, public authorities cannot go a very great distance."[2] There is every reason to believe, however, that the common experience of the country and the common sense of the West will prove a corrective to any tendencies which may make for a too one-sided social development, and that we may soon see the practice of sound principles of case work as universal in the West as it is becoming in the older sections of the country.

Probably the greatest single factor in the development of the movement in the West, as in the South, has been the work and influence of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation and the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, whose secretary devoted his energies to the Pacific States as his first field work under the new organization,[3] visiting in 1911 four cities in Oregon, Washington and California.[4] Since then many field visits have been paid to western communities, including the Southwest, either aiding in the

[1] See Anon., *Charities,* Vol. IX, p. 18 (1902), and *Charities and the Commons,* Vol. XX, p. 112 (1908).

[2] Francis H. McLean, "Getting Ahead of Social Problems," *The Survey,* Vol. XXVIII, p. 418 (1912).

[3] The new association, succeeding the work formerly done by the Russell Sage Foundation, was launched June, 1911.

[4] After this visit to the coast Mr. McLean wrote, "It is now possible to speak with some degree of confidence regarding an attested fact. That fact is, that every section of the nation, no matter how far pushed out on the frontier, is in need of the coöperative and systematic principles of organized charity." "Year Book," American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity, pp. 9-10 (1911-1912).

establishment of new societies or in strengthening work already begun, while the Charity Organization Department through its confidential bulletins and Charity Organization Institutes [1] has helped to build up a trained personnel in these same communities.

The Extension of the Movement to Smaller Communities

Although southwestern United States and the northwestern province of Canada soon constituted the frontier work ahead of the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity, they by no means comprised its only field of work. Since the nationalization of the movement an interesting change in opinion as to the size of population unit needing the services of a charity organization society has taken place. Not many years previous it was generally believed that it was hardly desirable to create a charity organization society in a community of less than 40,000. When the work of the Field Department of *Charities and The Commons* was begun, its program included preaching "the gospel of the paid trained secretary on full time in at least every city of 20,000 or over." By 1912 the slogan of the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity had become "organization as fast as possible in cities of 10,000 or over, experimental organization in cities of less than 10,000, all expansion to be regulated by adequately holding on to the ground which is gained." [2] To-day the unit of organization is 5,000 or even less. In fact, hardly any community is now considered too small to organize its charitable resources even when to do so it becomes necessary to share with another community or with a whole county the services of a paid professional

[1] Persons are admitted to these Institutes on invitation only. It has been the policy to extend invitations with a view to strengthening the movement nationally.

[2] Francis H. McLean, "Societies for Organizing Charity," *The Survey*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 538 (1912).

worker. Not social awakening but insight and organization and paid leadership in plain everyday problems are necessary to rural and semi-rural development.

The extension of the movement to the smaller communities throughout the country has constituted the heaviest responsibility of the national association. This has been true not only because the field has been so extensive and the number of persons qualified for such leadership so small, but because the extension has involved working out various forms of organization adapted to the varying and individual needs of the smaller community.

Because of the social needs on the one hand and the demands of social economy on the other, many communities found it impossible to organize charity organization societies of the pattern of the older eastern societies. Accordingly, some interesting modifications were soon evolved in the form of groupal societies where several towns combine under one competent trained worker who organizes family and community service under separate committees for each geographical area.[1] Another form of modification has been the county society, where a whole county combines under a trained worker.[2] Still another modification, first worked out in Grinnell, Iowa, provides a combination of public and private relief under a board of citizens and one trained worker acting as secretary and overseer of the poor. The Social Service League of Grinnell administers not only relief, but is responsible for work with children, the promotion of recreational faculties and other civic effort.[3]

[1] Illustrations of this last form are "The Neighborhood League," an organization serving the Main Line territory from Radnor to Paoli in Pennsylvania, the Champaign-Urbana Society in Illinois and a tri-city organization, comprising the cities of LaSalle, Peru and Oglesby, Illinois.

[2] Illustrations are found in the Social Service League of New Albany, Ind., and the Monmouth County Branch of the State Charities Aid Association of New York.

[3] The tri-combination of positions and functions first tried in Grinnell, Iowa, was the result of a visit by Mr. Hanson, a member of

As a method of social advance, charity organization has within it powers of adaptation not always found in the more highly specialized movements.

In short, during the fifteen years just reviewed, the movement has grown more than during all the years before, the number of societies to-day being approximately double that of 1905. The movement has not only taken firmer root in many communities where it had long been found [1] but has spread to the old South, the Southwest and along the Pacific Coast. Coincident with this geographic expansion has been an extension of the movement to the smaller cities and towns and in some instances to rural communities, until it may justly be claimed that the movement has become literally national.

The Introduction of C. O. S. Methods into New Fields

Of equal importance with the geographical extension of the movement just noted has been the adaptation of charity organization methods to other fields of activity, until to-day these methods with certain natural modifications, are employed by scores of organizations that have no claim to organizing charity. The most significant instances of such "extension" have been in the fields of medical social service, disaster relief and home service, to each of which special mention will presently be made.

the Executive Committee of the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity. For an account of the extension of the Grinnell plan to other communities throughout Iowa and the part played therein by the University of Iowa, see Bessie A. McClenahan, "Social Service by a State University," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 485-487 (1915).

[1] An interesting illustration has been the renewed youth of the St. Paul, Minnesota, Associated Charities, one of the oldest of American societies which after an honorable record of achievement, had lagged somewhat in more recent years.

Medical Social Work and the Movement for Organizing Charity

In the chapter discussing "Principles and Methods of Charity Organization," reference was made to the use that many hospitals were making of these principles and methods in their work of curing disease and of preventing its recurrence. The year 1905 saw the organization of the first social service department in a dispensary,[1] and the beginning of a movement for trained social work in medical institutions that has resulted in the creation of not less than 300 social service departments throughout the United States, employing in some instances forty or fifty paid workers, together with a large group of volunteers. The movement whose history we are here recounting has played not a small part in the origin and development of hospital social service. In her book, "Social Work in Hospitals," Miss Ida M. Cannon mentions four important contributions which have been made to the development of hospital social work; first, by the society for the after care of the insane in England; second, by the lady almoners in London hospitals; third, by visiting nursing in its various forms; fourth, by the methods of social training given medical students in the Johns Hopkins Hospital.[2]

"The second and probably most important contribution to hospital social service," writes Miss Cannon, "comes from the reorganization of the work of the lady almoners by Mr. C. S. Loch of the London Charity Organization Society." [3] The fourth contribution, the methods of social training given medical students in the Johns Hopkins Hospital, she describes as "the most significant contribution to the early development of hospital social service in the United States." [4] Doctor Charles P.

[1] The Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston.
[2] Ida M. Cannon, "Social Work in Hospitals," p. 7 (1913).
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Emerson, who was responsible for the introduction of this newer type of training at Johns Hopkins Hospital, writes: "It was partly to aid their education that seven years ago (1902) some of the medical students of the Johns Hopkins University organized the first student board of the Charity Organization Society of Baltimore. They visit one poor family, or at most two families, assigned them by this society, for weeks, months, or even for years. They do what they can to improve conditions in those households. No effort is made to select for these students families in which there is sickness.. The students learn how the poor man lives, works, and thinks; what his problems are; what burdens he must bear.

In five years there were on the rolls of active volunteer workers of the three students' boards over sixty students, or one-quarter of the entire enrollment of the school. They do not meet in the hospital but in the office of the Charity Organization Society. The reason for this was that every member of the self-appointed committee which guided this work was connected with the hospital and was also a manager of the Charity Organization Society; hence no conflict between these two interests could arise. All the patients at this hospital who seemed to need special social service were referred directly to this society, but the most interesting, and the best cases for the students to study are not these medical cases. This organized student work, with its purpose of training doctors in social work is, we believe, a very important department of the hospital." [1]

The hospital social service movement had its birth in Boston, when in October, 1905, the Massachusetts General Hospital, of which Dr. Richard C. Cabot was head, opened its social service department. He asked the hospital to provide a trained nurse whose duty it would be to

[1] It is interesting to recall in connection with the work in Baltimore just described, that as early as 1889 in a two days conference on charities organized by the Charity Organization Society of Baltimore the relation of the hospital work and charity organization was discussed.

remain in the dispensary so that patients who needed more than medicine, could be referred to her.[1] He wanted to learn in the first place, just how many such persons there were. One week's demonstration was sufficient to justify the inauguration of such a service. The nurse was swamped with work. It is of interest to learn in Dr. Cabot's own words of the incident that led to the organization of the new department, as it so well states the raison d'etre of such work. A ten-months'-old baby suffering with stomach trouble was brought to the hospital; "we took it into the hospital," writes Dr. Cabot, "and in about five weeks we returned it cured. We had in the meantime expended about thirty dollars. When we returned the baby it was without any instructions to anybody. . . . This baby was discharged cured into the arms of a generous, whole-souled mother, who wanted to give her children the best of everything. So the child got a hair-raising assortment of food, and in a few weeks turned up at the hospital precisely as sick as before. Again thirty dollars' worth of care was spent. Again the baby was turned over 'cured' to its uninstructed mother and again the trouble occurred. It promised to be a case of perpetual motion. Baby goes out, baby gets sick, baby comes back, baby goes out, and so on forever." [2]

Beginning with one worker, the social service department grew until it had many times that number of paid workers and a still larger staff of volunteers.[3] By 1910 its annual budget had grown to over $11,000. As the work developed, it gradually divided itself into a number of departments, e.g., departments for the tuberculous, for

[1] The founder of Hospital Social Service first became interested in social work through the work of the Boston Children's Aid Society, then under a pioneer in the children's field, Charles W. Birtwell.

[2] Philip Davis, editor "The Field of Social Service." See Chap. V by Dr. R. C. Cabot, "Health and Medical Social Service," pp. 70-71 (1915).

[3] The Boston Associated Charities coöperated through its general secretary, who frequently spoke to the workers at the Hospital on the principles and methods of social case work.

nervous people, for the problem of sex, and for teaching hygiene. The spread of the truth that all medical workers need for their own best work, the social point of view of which hospital social service is the embodiment, soon reflected itself in the increasing use of the Boston Confidential Exchange by medical agencies. In 1900 the Confidential Exchange received from medical agencies 32 reports, and sent to the medical agencies 7. Ten years later it received 4,226 reports and sent 1,745.[1] The development of the movement throughout the country since 1905 has been, as stated, phenomenal. It has included in its scope public as well as privately endowed hospitals and dispensaries.

The socializing of the medical profession has been accompanied by medicalizing the trained social worker. This has resulted in a new kind of social case work which takes into account the vital connection of air and sunlight to health and well-being—a social case work that recognizes the fact that crankiness, not to mention inefficiency, is often due to sickness. Since 1905 there has been a more general recognition that "C. O. S. cases" are often sick cases. The renaissance of social case work which characterizes the period here surveyed was in no small measure due to the growth of the fundamental idea underlying medical social service.

The Beginnings of Special Treatment for the Handicapped

The year following the launching of the hospital social work movement, the New York Charity Organization Society established a special employment bureau for placing the physically, mentally and socially handicapped in positions where their particular handicap would not interfere with the work to be done. The project grew out

[1] Thirty-second Annual Report of the Associated Charities of Boston, p. 13 (1911).

of a local physician's isolated experiments with his dispensary patients and the problems constantly faced by the Society in its treatment of homeless men. It was the hope of the Society that "this bureau would succeed in preventing disease and disability by placing in suitable employment, before invalidism had resulted, those unable without danger to their health to continue their usual occupations; and that it would succeed in restoring entirely or partially to self-support those physically so disabled or otherwise handicapped as to have no available opportunity for employment."[1]

The more important classes among the handicapped who came to the bureau were the aged, cripples, invalids (chiefly tuberculosis), convalescents, and physical and mental defectives. After the bureau had been in operation two years, the number of applicants averaged over a hundred a month, with number of placements amounting to 80 per cent. of the applications. The wages obtained averaged about seven dollars a week, or not much less than the average for unskilled able-bodied labor. In spite of the fact that the bureau had thus rendered a unique and invaluable service to its numerous beneficiaries, and thereby materially lessened the demand upon the charitable resources of the community, and "in spite of the fact that an employment bureau is believed to be a final solution for certain individuals and perhaps even for certain classes among the handicapped," the twenty-eighth annual report of the Society stated "it is nevertheless clear that placement of individuals is merely a temporizing measure as applied to the larger classes, and that for adequate handling of the problems presented by them, resort must be had to larger measures,"[2] such as compulsory insurance for old age, workmen's compensation, and the pre-

[1] Thirtieth Annual Report of The Charity Organization Society of The City of New York, p. 55 (1912).

[2] Twenty-eighth Annual Report of The Charity Organization Society of the City of New York, p. 46 (1910).

vention of industrial accidents. But above all, because it was felt that the bureau had failed to accomplish its primary purpose it was abolished in 1912. In the words of those responsible for the work it had failed because it had "not been possible to secure such interest on the part of employers and such continued coöperation on the part of dispensaries and hospitals, as to bring together prospective employees and employers with suitable work to afford, soon enough to accomplish the desired result."[1] It had also failed to accomplish its second purpose because it had found it "impossible to create a market for the labor of crippled adults without fitting them, by training in suitable kinds of industry, to compete on practically even terms with those who are not handicapped."[2] The natural and desirable arrangement seemed to associate the employment of persons so handicapped with a training school adapted to their needs. As this type of school was then about to open its doors, the time seemed opportune for the Society to discontinue its special work for the handicapped. The effort to find employment for handicapped persons in families under the care of the Society was not abandoned, but was assumed by those at work in the respective districts of the Society. In spite of the abandonment of special work for the handicapped, the experiment just described proved an authoritative contribution to social experience and has since blazed the trail for similar work by other social agencies,[3] especially by the American Red Cross in its work with war cripples.

[1] Thirtieth Annual Report, The Charity Organization Society of The City of New York, p. 55 (1912).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

The Minneapolis Society seems to have had similar difficulties in conducting an employment bureau limited to the handicapped.

[3] See Richard C. Cabot, "Health and Medical Social Service," Chapter V of the "Field of Social Service," ed. by Philip Davis, pp. 75-76 (1915). Also "Labor Exchangers for Cincinnati Handicapped," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 189-190 (1914), and Ruth A. Adamson, "A Workshop for the Handicapped," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 392-393 (1916).

The Inebriate

One of the most difficult types of problems confronting family social workers is that of the inebriate. Like devil-grass, alcoholism often underlies many other problems, especially vagrancy, desertion and non-support. In 1907 the Boston Associated Charities made an interesting study of families in which some member of the family was intemperate. Among other things, it showed what was found true elsewhere, "that it was worth while to work for the reform of drunkards through individual treatment, but that such work must be supplemented by intelligent action on the part of the courts." [1] Contemporaneous with the Boston study, the Associated Charities of Atlanta had succeeded in getting the City Council to pass an ordinance providing a probation officer to look after drunkards brought before the Court.

A few years later (1910), as the result in part of the labors of the Committee on Criminal Courts of the New York Charity Organization Society, a law was passed applicable to New York City, which represented the wisest and most advanced system of dealing with inebriates which had as yet been devised in America.[2] The measure substituted for short term commitments to the penitentiary for drunkenness, which involve stigma and contamination for the man, often poverty for his family, and cost to the taxpayers, a system of probation and probationary fines worked out without imprisonment; and for incorrigible offenders commitment to a farm colony and hospital for care and cure. The type of social machinery which such a law supplies makes possible a more efficient method of treatment in inebriate cases than previously was possible. In the same year as

[1] Margaret F. Byington, "What Social Workers Should Know About Their Own Communities," p. 22 (1911).

[2] The New York State Charities Aid through a committee on inebriety also played an active part.

the passage of this law the Buffalo Society created a Committee on Inebriety to work for the passage of a state law applicable to Buffalo, similar to the law of New York City. The law was passed the next year. Throughout the country from then on one finds a general and increasing interest among charity organization societies in a better handling of this problem.[1] It should be noted in passing that the wisdom of committing the habitual drunkard to the custody of a competent probation officer instead of fining him and imposing short sentences to jail or workhouse had long been recognized by those with first-hand knowledge of the problem.[2]

The Prevention of Alcoholism

Credit for the most active work to prevent alcoholism belongs to the Associated Charities of Boston. In most other places the local society has been preoccupied with the treatment of the inebriate, a phase of the problem more closely related to their immediate tasks. The more recent efforts of the Boston Society have placed the emphasis on prevention. As early as 1910 it formed a Committee for the Study of the Alcohol Problem, made up of men of various professions, but largely of well-known Boston physicians.[3]

The committee aimed "to undertake a scientific campaign against alcohol as careful and thorough as that which has been started against tuberculosis."[4] "Believing that the real solution of the alcohol problem will come only when public opinion has been aroused to full realiza-

[1] See also Inebriety Section, Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Correction, pp. 79-145, 43d session (1916).

[2] T. D. Crothers, M.D., "The Problem of Inebriate Pauperism," Proceedings, International Conference of Charities and Correction, pp. 140-146 (1893).

[3] One of the aims throughout was to keep the campaign a doctor's movement, in harmony with the trend of treating inebriety as a disease rather than as a moral defect to be reached by evangelical methods.

[4] Thirty-first Annual Report, Boston Associated Charities, p. 23 (1910).

tion of the harmfulness of alcohol," [1] the committee did not rush into legislation, but stood ready to supply information which would gradually help to mould public opinion. It also stood ready to aid well considered reform measures.

Realizing that "prevention" must begin with the young, the committee, through the coöperation of the State Board of Education, began giving, in 1911, lectures in some of the Normal schools of the State.[2] A series of stories for children was also published in a paper having a large circulation in Sunday schools. The Boston Society shortly after prepared a leaflet to social workers who, "tired 'of bailing with the tap on,' want to fight alcohol with increasing education." [3] By 1913 the committee had launched a vigorous poster campaign against alcohol, which played a definite part in the rising anti-alcohol movement, culminating in the passage of the Eighteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution.[4] In 1918 the social welfare agencies of the city broke through "their time-honored silence on the subject, when the eighteen agencies which make up the league for preventive work,[5] held a two-session conference on the social significance of alcohol, at which for the first time the facts as known through their work with families were given to the public, and later published by the league for immediate legislative use.

Charity Organization Societies and National Disasters

In the thirty-five years which preceded the period covered by this chapter there had occurred in the

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.

[2] These lectures were "Alcohol and Insanity"; "Alcohol and the Nervous System"; "Effect of Alcohol on Digestion," and "The Social Cost of Alcohol."

[3] Elizabeth Tilton, "Are Social Workers Neglecting the Alcohol Problem?" *The Survey*, Volume XXXI, p. 781 (1914).

[4] Posters placed in Boston in April, 1913, had before May of that year gone to Saskatchewan, Alaska, Oregon and California in the west, and south as far as Florida.

[5] See footnote p. 333.

United States at least twenty-seven great calamities—fires, earthquakes, floods, yellow fever, epidemics, droughts, hurricanes, cyclones, tidal waves, shipwreck—which made necessary the expenditure of at least $25,000,000 for purposes of relief. In many of these disasters charity organization societies had rendered yeoman service.[1]

The San Francisco Fire

Probably the greatest demonstration of the benefits in time of great disasters, of trained leadership and of methods which are known to preserve and reëstablish the spirit of independence in those who have suffered crushing loss, and which will safeguard the money contributed and account fully for all expenditures, came early in the years covered by this chapter, when in 1906 an earthquake and a fire resulting therefrom destroyed "the very heart and vitals" of the city of San Francisco. The number of buildings destroyed was 28,188, the number of persons made homeless about 200,000. The property loss has been estimated at $500,000,000, of which only $200,000,000 is believed to have been collected from the insurance companies. The seriousness of the situation following the disaster was enhanced by the comparative isolation of the city and by complete industrial paralysis. It was the first instance in the history of the movement where one of the larger societies was called upon to face a colossal catastrophe.[2] The immediate task was beyond

[1] For a discussion of relief measures at the Chicago fire, the Johnstown flood, the Paterson fire, the Baltimore fire and "The Slocum Disaster," see E. T. Devine, "Principles of Relief," Part IV (1904).

See also Walter S. Ufford, "How Baltimore's Emergency was Met by Local Coöperation," *Charities*, Vol. XI, pp. 133-135 (1903), and Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Fire Relief in Baltimore," *Charities*, Vol. XII, pp. 602-609 (1904).

[2] "A comparison of this fire with that of Chicago shows that Chicago's property loss was estimated at $192,000,000, while California's loss is placed at more than $250,000,000. The loss of life in Chicago was placed at about 300, while in San Francisco alone conservative estimates have been that 500 met death. The Chicago fire left 98,500 persons homeless; 300,000 in San Francisco alone are homeless. The

the strength of the home society. However, with approximately a year's time the local Associated Charities was able to take over all relief work and to place the remaining dependents on a more normal relief basis than had at first obtained.

The first attempt at meeting the emergency situation was the appointment by the Mayor of the city of a Citizens Committee of fifty persons. This committee created a sub-committee on finance, but did little else. With the prompt arrival of Dr. Edward T. Devine, then general secretary of the Charity Organization Society of New York City, sorely needed unification of activities was sought, and the Finance Committee became the Finance Committee of Relief and Red Cross Funds, which, in coöperation with the United States Army, soon gained a fairly complete control of relief activities. It is to the credit of the charity organization movement that many societies at great sacrifice to themselves sent their executive heads to the scene of the disaster. Besides the New York Society, which contributed the services of its general secretary, who assumed charge of the National Red Cross work, Chicago sent Ernest P. Bicknell,[1] then general superintendent of the Chicago Bureau of Charities, and the Boston Society lent several workers, including Miss Alice L. Higgins, then its general secretary. It is significant of the growth of the technique of social work and of the skill of these trained workers that it became the almost immediate conviction of the local business men comprising the Mayor's committee, that the matter of handling relief funds was a dangerous business, and could better be handled by specialists in such matters.[2]

catastrophe is unprecedented in this country in the amount of property destroyed, the area affected, the number rendered homeless, and in the distance from the great commercial centers." Archibald A. Hill, "San Francisco and the Relief Work Ahead," *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XVI, p. 135 (1906).

[1] Mr. Bicknell afterwards became head of The American National Red Cross.

[2] Joseph Lee, "Charity and Democracy," *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XVII, p. 391 (1906).

The real vindication of the method of charity organization lies in the fact that there were no real dependents to be found as a result of the fire.[1] Those making the San Francisco Relief Survey found that although the burden of dependency was shown to have been greater after the disaster, judicious use of the relief funds and improvements in organization made better results possible.[2] Thus it could truly be said that the administration of the relief funds of ten million dollars afforded the most conspicious demonstration that had ever been given of the value of coöperation and organization in relief, and the extent to which professional knowledge in relief administration had come to be appreciated by the public.[3]

Institutional Membership in the American Red Cross

The American Red Cross, organized in 1881, was granted by Congress in 1905 a special charter empowering it "to continue and carry on a system of national and international relief in times of peace, and apply the same in mitigating the suffering caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods and other great national calamities, and to devise and carry on measures for preventing the same."[4] Recognizing from the experiences already noted, especially that of the San Francisco disaster, that it was essential to bring to the command of the Red Cross for emergency work trained service such as is to be found in the ranks of well-organized charitable societies in the larger cities of the country, there was created in 1909 an "Institutional Membership" of the American

[1] From an interview with the general Secretary of the Associated Charities of San Francisco, July, 1912.

[2] John F. Moors, book review of "San Francisco Relief Survey," in *The Survey*, Vol. XXX, p. 435 (1913).

[3] See twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York, p. 54 (1907).

[4] Fifth paragraph of section 3 of the above mentioned charter.

National Red Cross,[1] into which from time to time there has been invited certain of the more efficient charity organization societies of the country. Since this step many societies, at great sacrifice to themselves, have done invaluable service under the banner of the Red Cross, notably in the Washington Place fire, New York City, in 1911,[2] in the *Titanic* disaster of 1912, in the disastrous floods of the Ohio River valley in 1913,[3] and more recently in the capsizing of the *Eastland* in the Chicago River tragedy, not to mention a number of forest fires, tornado and mine disasters.

Occasionally such disasters, as in the case of the Ohio flood, which covered so wide a territory, revealed charity organization societies, in name only, which kept no records of families helped and were broken reeds when the test of disaster came. Perhaps the greatest need to

[1] "In the event of disaster requiring large and unusual measures of relief, the institutional member in the community in which such disaster occurs, as the executive agent of the Red Cross, will be expected to take instant relief action in the name of the Red Cross, pending the arrival of the National Director. Such emergency relief work by an institutional member will be under the supervision of the National Relief Board and the immediate direction of the National Director.

"An institutional member will not be required to collect money or supplies for Red Cross emergency relief purposes.

"An institutional member is to be solely an executive agent.

"In order to fulfill its functions as an institutional member of the Red Cross, a charity organization society is expected to form a Red Cross Emergency Relief Committee with representation thereon of the local chapter of the Red Cross, if such there be. This Committee as a nucleus committee should be permanent, and may be temporarily enlarged upon the occurrence of a disaster requiring large and unusual emergency relief measures.

"An institutional member is also expected, when practicable, to send one or more trained agents to participate in relief work outside of its own community, when called for by the National Director."

Extract from the Regulations Governing Institutional Membership in the American Red Cross. See "Emergency Relief after the Washington Place Fire," Report, Red Cross Emergency Relief Committee of the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York, p. 70 (1912).

[2] See "Emergency Relief after the Washington Place Fire," New York, March 25, 1911. Report of the Red Cross Emergency Relief Committee of the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York (1912).

[3] For a full account of the relief measures used in the Ohio flood disaster see *The Survey*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 135-153 (1914).

which many of these disasters called attention was that of a permanent and well-balanced family social agency. In places where such societies existed the administration of relief was expedited and safeguarded at many points by close coöperation with them, and when it came time for the Red Cross to withdraw and leave the last stages of rehabilitation in the hands of a community itself, it was often the charity organization society that stepped into the breach and carried the work to a successful conclusion.[1]

The Depression of 1907-08

Because of the industrial paralysis of the country in 1907-08, charity organization societies on all sides reported an increase in distress. The number of applicants during the three winter months was in many places double that of the winter before, while the number during the spring had more than quadrupled the corresponding figure of the year previous. Although the number of clients fell off during the summer, as was to be expected, it was often, nevertheless, over twice the number of the preceding summer. Naturally, on all hands, there was a phenomenal increase in the problem of the unemployed single man.

As soon as it became evident that an industrial depression had gripped the country, a number of societies prepared for the aftermath of distress. There was a disposition manifested in many quarters not to repeat the mistakes made during the depression of 1893-94, and to profit by the lessons then learned. Sixteen of the larger societies exchanged confidential letters every week or two during the winter in which were given their daily experiences and proposed next steps. The judgment of the majority of societies was to avoid treating the problem *en masse*, but as far as possible so to decentralize its handling that it would not get beyond control, stampeding

[1] For a general discussion of the principles and methods of disaster relief see J. Byron Deacon, "Disasters," (1918). See also "When Disaster Comes," a symposium, *The Survey*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 113-153 (1914).

them into lowering standards. In many cities the societies for organizing charity were able not only to discourage centralized general schemes for dealing with distress,[1] but also to differentiate sharply between plans for the homeless and those for family distress. Frequently they urged the expansion of existing agencies to meet the situation, held conferences with such agencies, sought a logical division of work among them, quietly tried to get information about real need from those most likely to know, secured additional funds in unadvertised ways that would not increase unnecessary applications for help and greatly enlarged their regular staff of workers.

An effort was made in many places to secure work for able-bodied men with families rather than to grant relief direct. In some places this took the form of coöperation with the city and other social agencies in the work of street cleaning in less privileged neighborhoods, the men so employed being from families which the local society would in any event have to help. Such also served as a work test. In other places it took the form of coöperation with the manufacturers who increased their forces in the production of staple articles and in rotation of employees so as to give some work to the largest possible number of men.

In a number of cities more good could have been done had the local societies had more money, especially for salaries for additional workers, to relieve those greatly overworked.[2] Even so, the amount of distress was infinitely less than where there was no charity organization society, as in Pittsburgh, at the time. In such places, although the poor did not starve on the streets, families were broken up because of poverty, others were underfed or poorly housed.

The situation at no time reached the stage where

[1] This was not true of Chicago where a general citizens' appeal was made.

[2] See the Thirty-second Annual Report of the Charity Organization Society of Buffalo, p. 5 (1909).

emergency agencies of the size of the East Side Relief Committee of New York or the Central Relief Association of Chicago, to mention but two of the temporary organizations that the depression of 1893-94 called into being, were found necessary. Work rooms for women characterizing the former depression were not a feature of the relief measures of 1907-08. Also there was far less of the type of mushroom organization that trades so largely on emotionalism and is responsible to no one either for funds or quality of work. In short, although the methods pursued by charity organization societies in meeting their problems during the depression of 1907-08 were open in many places to criticism, some merited and some not,[1] it nevertheless remains true that they mark a distinct advance in the field of administering adequate relief along scientific lines as contrasted with the situation in 1893-94.

One of the results of the depression was a large increase in the number of charity organization societies launched immediately after the worst of the storm had passed. Many unemployed who could weather one year of hard times could not weather two, and so went over the poverty line the second year. Societies were launched in reply to citizen appeals that something be done to meet these conditions, for not until 1910 had the industrial storm completely spend its force.

An Effort to Solve the Problem of Unemployment

With pictures of distress due to the depression of 1907-08 fresh in their memories and believing that much suffering at other times is due to involuntary unemploy-

[1] For example the methods used by the New York Society brought charges from many settlement workers of failure to meet the situation adequately. Almost unconsciously there seems to be a tendency for settlement workers to magnify and for charity organization workers to minimize the amount of distress at such times. Their respective angle of approach to the situation largely explains these different tendencies.

ment,[1] a group of public-spirited citizens of New York City, identified in the main with the local Charity Organization Society,[2] organized in 1909 an employment bureau known as the National Employment Exchange. A fund of $100,000 was guaranteed in order that the work could be carried on without any handicap during the first few years of its existence. The object, from the beginning, however, was that it should ultimately be self-supporting, as it was believed that "a business rather than a charity would attract a better class of both employers and employees.[3] The new enterprise was noteworthy if for no other reason than that it was planned not as an emergency measure to deal with a temporary situation, but was founded on the belief that there is need at all times of adequate machinery to bring the manless job and the jobless man together.[4]

The causal relation between unemployment and poverty had frequently been driven home. Previous attempts had, however, been limited in the main either to emer-

[1] In 1896 Mr. Francis H. McLean, then of the New York Society, had selected from among those who applied to the Society in the year ending June, 1896, 720 cases in which lack of employment was assigned as the chief cause of need. (There were 924 such cases out of a total of 1884 families known to the Society for the first time that year). In 107 cases it was later decided there had been some other cause for the destitution; in all cases it was found there was no need. Of the remaining 502 there were 106 cases in which the cause of need was doubtful, leaving 332 cases where the need was evidently due to unemployment. For a fuller statement of the relationship of unemployment and poverty see E. T. Devine, "Misery and its Causes," pp. 115-135 (1913).

[2] Jacob H. Schiff, Robert W. deForest, Otto T. Bannard, Edward T. Devine and John R. MacArthur were the prime movers in the work. The idea was suggested by Mr. Schiff and furthered by a report by Edward T. Devine as to the need of such a bureau, published by the Russell Sage Foundation.

[3] First Annual Report, National Employment Exchange, p. 6 (1910).

[4] It should be borne in mind that only recently has society begun to recognize unemployment as a problem of other than times of depression. In 1910 the International Association on Unemployment was organized. In 1911 came the American Committee on Unemployment of the American Association for Labor Legislation, which the year following became the American Section of the International Association on Unemployment. It was not until 1914 that a National Conference on Unemployment met in the United States and for the first time focussed the attention of the whole country upon the problem.

gency measures at times of industrial crises or to work for the handicapped.[1] However, it should be added that from no quarters did there come at this time any persistent agitation for a nation-wide system of labor exchanges that would function in seasons of prosperity and depression. Although approximately half the states of the Union had established free employment offices, following Ohio's lead of 1891, nevertheless nothing like a body of scientific administrative principles had been developed among them. There was "no uniformity in their method, no coöperation between offices, no definite policies of management." There was "little or no comprehension of the nature of the business." [2]

Charity Organization and Industry

Interest of charity organization leaders in industrial problems has by no means been limited to unemployment. Mention has already been made of the Pittsburgh Survey, that pioneer piece of social investigation which was conceived, planned and carried through by one of the standing committees of the New York Charity Organization Society.[3] *Charities*, and its successor, *Charities and The Commons,* published by this same society along with its other interests, gave continuous and searching attention to all phases of industrial problems. It is not, therefore, surprising to learn that the United States Industrial Commission, appointed by President Wilson in 1914, owed the fact of its existence in large measure to two members of this same society, one of whom had been chairman of the improvised committee which prepared a memorandum on the subject at

[1] Possible exceptions may be made here in such efforts as that of the Buffalo Society in 1898 when it procured the passage of Employment Bureau ordinances, regulating exorbitant and fraudulent charges.

[2] See William M. Leiserson, "The Theory of Public Employment Offices and the Principles of Their Practical Administration," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 29, pp. 28-46 (1914).

[3] See p. 305.

the President's request for use in his message to Congress, and both of whom devoted a large part of their time for several months to securing the legislation creating the Commission.[1]

Although no other charity organization society has taken so conspicuous a lead in working for a solution of those industrial problems whose existence lays so heavy a burden on these societies, it by no means follows that many other charity organization societies have not either officially or through the activities of their executive secretaries supported child labor legislation, workmen's compensation legislation, and legislation prohibiting manufacturing in tenements. In 1917 the American Association for Organizing Charity passed a resolution calling for every effort on the part of member societies to prevent the breaking down of industrial laws in the passage of which many of the societies had been active, on the false assumption that the crises of war demanded it.

Interest in industry as it relates to social work is, however, by no means limited to charity organization societies. Though the problems of industry were seldom if ever directly touched upon at meetings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction antedating the period covered by this chapter, since then there has been an increasing interest at its sessions in the industrial field.[2]

The Industrial Depression of 1914-15

An industrial depression, beginning in 1914-15, once again brought the charity organization societies of the country face to face with a winter of distress surpassing

[1] Edward T. Devine, "Organized Charity and Industry," Studies in Social Work, No. 2, published by The New York School of Philanthropy (1915).

[2] After three years of discussion a committee on standards of living and labor of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, drafted in 1912 a platform of "industrial minimums" covering standards of wages, hours, safety and health, housing, term of working life, compensation and insurance, which showed a grasp of the fundamental relation of industry to social work.

even that of 1907-08. After making allowances for the fact that New York City, like Chicago, Kansas City and Seattle, is a reserve city where the unemployed congregate during the winter awaiting distribution to new kinds of employment, 400,000 to 440,000 simultaneously unemployed in New York City in the early months of 1915 indicated conditions of nation-wide unemployment of great seriousness. An estimate of two million jobless in the United States during the winter of 1914-15 is conservative.[1]

Even though a large number of the unemployed as in previous depressions never applied for relief from any charity organization society, the depression as in similar emergencies before, not only greatly increased the number of individuals asking their help, but also complicated their regular year-to-year work.[2] The situation was made more difficult by the fact that with the public imagination absorbed in the European tragedy, there was a tendency at first to forget the suffering at home, with the result that in many places there was a decrease in contributions for relief in the face of an increase of misery. In at least two communities the local charity organization society

[1] Trustworthy unemployment statistics do not exist in the United States. The first of a continuing series of unemployment studies in this country was published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in May, 1916. The second study in the series showed that during March and the first part of April, 1915, the percentage of unemployed wage-earners in fifteen cities was 11.5, and in addition the percentage of those working part time was 16.6.

[2] The average number of families under care of the four largest relief societies of New York City increased in the fiscal years 1913-14 and 1914-15 over the number cared for in the fiscal year 1912-13, 23 per cent and 57 per cent respectively, while the expenditures for relief increased 14 per cent and 17 per cent respectively. Expenditures for material relief as here used does not include service or expenditures for relief other than to families in their houses. See Report, Mayor's Committee on Unemployment, New York City, p. 25 (1916). The number of families never before brought to the attention of the Boston Associated Charities during the twelve months ending September 30, 1915, showed an increase of 28 per cent over the previous year and of more than 50 per cent compared with the number of new families under care during the twelve months ending September 30, 1913. The increase was primarily due to unemployment.

had to close its doors temporarily for lack of funds.[1] It is encouraging to add that these were the exception. In New York City, in spite of the big sums sent abroad, contributions to local charities were larger than ever.

One cannot understand the rôle of charity organization societies in the depression unless one appreciates the fact that to a degree unknown before, employment was viewed as a community responsibility and the remedy for it, work. Since the last depression the creation of Departments of Public Welfare, beginning in 1911, in Kansas City, Missouri, had taken place in a number of cities. Even where no such Departments existed, municipal responsibility for certain social problems, as municipal lodging houses, public playgrounds and recreation centers, was being increasingly recognized. Public employment bureaus had practically had their birth since the trying days of 1893-94. It was this growing civic consciousness that explains one of the outstanding features of the depression, namely, the appointment by the mayors of a number of cities,[2] including New York and Chicago, of commissions on unemployment who were not only to study the problem but also to recommend and carry out measures for meeting the situation. It was also the increasing realization of the community's responsibility for unemployment and the belief that the chief remedy is work that explains the number of workshops and wood camps opened by local municipalities and the appeals to employers to "carry on" made in the give-a-job movement that was a feature in a number of places.[3]

[1] These were Jacksonville, Florida, and Des Moines, Iowa. See Anon., *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 99 and 100 (1914). In both instances the societies soon renewed operations.

[2] In Massachusetts, the Governor appointed a Committee to Promote Work. The Governor of California designated the State Commission of Immigration and Housing to take charge of the unemployment situation. In addition representatives of seven cities met during the winter of 1914-15 at San Francisco in conference on unemployment.

[3] Believing that unemployment should not be dealt with "as a problem of relief" nor regarded as a temporary problem but "as

In some instances the social workers of the community had been active in petitioning for the appointment of the above-mentioned commissions; in practically all they gave their interest and hearty support. The commissions' various reports on the whole show a clear grasp of the problem and the measures recommended mark progress in understanding the principles of emergency relief.[1]

Although there were established in a number of places palliatives such as bread lines, soup kitchens, free food centers, "bundle days" and free "hotels," [2] there was less of the type of irresponsible philanthropy of doubtful wisdom that had been prominent in the depression of 1893-94.

Partly because workshops were a feature of the programs of certain of the municipal commissions on unemployment and public work was pushed where possible, but largely because charity organization societies were more nearly able to cope adequately with the situation, emergency relief agencies of the type of the East Side Relief Committee and the Central Relief Association of days of '93-94, were not called into existence.

Instead, one finds the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, early in the fall of 1914, sending a questionnaire to societies in cities of over 100,000 population to ascertain what the signs

a great and persistent problem" worthy of the "consideration of and action by those who are the dominant forces in our American industrial life," the Mayor of New York City appointed a committee on unemployment and relief with Elbert H. Gary, chairman, which included among its fourscore members, bankers, clergymen, labor leaders, both men and women, railroad presidents, and state and city officials, as well as the heads of leading family agencies of the city and other social workers.

[1] See especially the report on "How to Meet Hard Times," Mayor's Committee on Unemployment, New York City (1916), and the Report of the Municipal Markets Commission of Chicago (1914).

[2] "Hotels de Gink," as they were sometimes called, were organized in several places. The hotels were partially self-governing, the inmates holding an open court and adopting their own code of rules.

were for an unusual winter. Shortly after, seventeen charity organization societies in cities with populations of 100,000 or over sent representatives to a private conference in New York City held under the auspices of the above-mentioned department. Soon thereafter, the general superintendent of the United Charities of Chicago drafted a comprehensive program for relieving and in part heading off unemployment and general distress in Chicago during the coming winter. The program gave in concise form some of the more important conclusions unanimously arrived at in the conference of executives of general charitable societies just referred to. Copies of this program were put in the hands of every charity organization society in the United States and the program was printed in full in *The Survey*.[1] Experience in meeting the emergency was also pooled through an Emergency Winter Exchange, conducted by the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, to which various societies throughout the country sent monthly written reports stating the methods being employed in their respective communities.

In a number of places charity organization societies preached the gospel of preparedness for the coming storm, calling conferences of local social agencies to discuss the situation confronting them and urging the community to make use of the established agencies rather than to create new organizations for needs which might arise. In some places the city was urged by these conferences to undertake at once all public improvements already contemplated and to employ as many extra street cleaners as necessary. In most places charity organization societies made ready for the increased demands upon them by seeking and often gaining increased support; by employing a larger staff of social workers; and by welcoming and using to the utmost the service of socially minded volun-

[1] See "A Chicago Plan for Meeting Unemployment and Destitution," *The Survey*," Vol. XXXIII, pp. 217-218 (1914).

teers who, stirred by the need of the hour, came forward as they had never come before.[1]

Finding work for the unemployed was the most imperative task facing many of the societies. Although efforts in this direction often failed, many a family owed its escape from permanent dependency to some charity organization worker who, in spite of discouragements, persisted in efforts to convince employers and friends that the most effective means of meeting the situation was to give employment.[2]

The task however so often proved impossible that certain societies were led to take the initiative in creating opportunities for work. Outstanding among these was the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor.[3] Finding so many of its problems resolved themselves largely into a question of relief, giving groceries and rent, where the one thing needed and wanted was work, the association arranged with the city to clear lands of the Bronx Botanical Gardens and the Zoological Park, and to do the incidental trenching, grading and roadmaking. This was work which was needed to be done but for which the city itself had no funds. The money which the association had been paying out as relief was converted into wages for the men. The work kept the men in physical trim to swing back into their own occupations when the wheels of trade and

[1] The New York Society enjoyed a most phenomenal growth in the number of its volunteers. During the winter 271 persons offered their services, bringing the total volunteer force to 624, the largest number in the history of the Society. The Philadelphia Society added 350 volunteers to its staff, in addition to 18 new paid workers. See also Anon., *The Survey,* Vol. XXXIII, p. 349 (1915).

[2] In addition to personal solicitation the United Charities of Chicago had a good response to a folder entitled "About That Work You Want Done," which enumerated the kinds of odd jobs for which it was prepared to furnish men and women. The Memphis Associated Charities posted at the various exchanges, including the real estate, the merchants, and the cotton, lists of the men (giving age and equipment but no name) for whom it was seeking jobs.

[3] The Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor is a charity organization society in all but name. See footnote page 169.

industry should quicken, at the same time affording a test that separated the shirker, loafer, inefficient and physically incapacitated from those willing and able to work.[1] Every precaution was taken to keep the plan from savoring in any way of relief in the belief that "doles of work" for "doles of pay" does not deceive men, and that a work test falls short of its purpose except as the jobs offered are for a fair wage and under conditions which do not tend to destroy a man's self-respect. Accordingly, arrangements were made whereby the men reported to the park superintendent for the places. Supervision and discipline were left to the regular park foreman, the understanding being that a good day's work would be required of every man sent, and failure to comply with such requirement would mean dismissal. Wages were paid weekly by the park paymaster, who was reimbursed by the association. The wage rate was $2 a day. Thus a man was assured $6 a week for three days' work, and on the alternate days he could do other irregular work or search for an opening at his regular occupation. The whole plan was launched on the assumption that the need for it would be transient, though urgent at the time.

Following much the same plan, the Associated Charities of Minneapolis persuaded the local Park Board to turn over to it for the employment of men whose families were in distress the task of clearing a strip of low land previous to its being flooded by the erection of a dam in the Mississippi. There were no commercial bids for this clearing, which provided not only interesting work but also enhanced the appearance and sanitation of the city.

In Dayton, two of the local improvement clubs, at the request of the Associated Charities, listed vacant lots and alleys which needed cleaning, and trees which needed to be cut down in their respective districts. Different

[1] For an interesting account of the experiment and of the success of this particular feature of the plan see an account by W. H. Matthews under the caption, "Wages from Relief Funds," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 245-247 (1915).

members of the clubs acted as superintendents of the work and different groups of men were sent daily to places where work was being done, payment for work being made in coal or groceries by the Associated Charities. The secretary of the local Associated Charities reported that the men employed took pride in working for the betterment of their sections of the city, and the men in charge of the work became personally acquainted with men needing employment, and so were able to help them in other ways.[1]

In the main, charity organization societies throughout the country relied upon other channels such as the city government and industry, to provide the much needed jobs, contenting themselves with stimulating and coöperating in all efforts looking to the provision of real work.

Fortunately the country was able relatively quickly to adjust itself to war conditions. War orders made work not only in the munitions and supply business, but also in scores of other fields, noticeably in transportation, with the result that unemployment, though always a problem, practically disappeared. This does not mean that the scourge of unemployment had not an aftermath in an increase of acute and chronic illness of which the lay public of many communities was oblivious.

If periods of industrial depression afford a means of gauging the progress of the charity organization movement, then the evidence on hand would seem to show that the principles of emergency relief were more intelligently applied in 1914-15 than they had been in either of the depressions of 1893-94 or 1907-08. As compared with other lean years, there was less talk of soup kitchens and bread lines, though some cities had their share. The homeless man was also not so much before the public eye. It was also an encouraging advance over other periods of industrial hardship that in most cities which made

[1] See Grace O. Edwards, "Clean-up by Unemployed," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 96 (1915).

appropriations with the emergency in view, action took the form of providing real work at real wages. Philadelphia was the only large city that voted money for emergency relief only.[1] General relief schemes common to so-called emergency situations gained headway in but few places. Temporary relief agencies were conspicuous by their rareness. Where they existed they tended to duplicate effort [2] and unnecessarily to confuse the situation. On the other hand, many communities recognized the truth that to give time and money to strengthening and extending the work of well-established and responsible agencies is to give twice, just as truly as when one gives quickly. This meant that standards of work did not sag in general as they had tended to do in earlier depressions. In short, there seems to have been "more intelligent use of service resources than in 1907." [3] There was also a better organization of employment opportunities "without recourse to costly and ineffective 'pseudo-work,' and at the same time better use of increased relief resources." [4]

These various gains of charity organization were due in no small measure to relatively greater preparedness among the societies resulting from the nationalization of the movement. Not only had the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation early held a conference of representatives of the larger societies as

[1] The Emergency Aid Committee—a committee of Philadelphia women organized originally for war relief work—succeeded in getting the City Council to appropriate $50,000 to relieve the sufferings of the unemployed. The Society for Organizing Charity opposed the appropriation, urging that a far better plan would be to push at the time certain contemplated public improvements and municipal work. Several months later the City Council made a second similar appropriation. The bills were signed by the Mayor (Rudolph Blankenberg), though under protest as wrong in principle.

[2] As partial illustration see the 37th Annual Report, Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity, p. 18 (1915). Of the first 700 applications to the Emergency Aid Committee mentioned in the last footnote, 600 were already under the care of existing social agencies.

[3] Francis H. McLean, "Charity Societies," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 207 (1915).

[4] *Ibid.*

has been stated, but during the winter of the depression the office of the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity had conducted correspondence with no less than 289 cities on all conceivable points regarding organizations under given conditions and regarding policy in connection with situations which had arisen in the adaptation of the existing activities of the societies to the emergency of the winter.

The Movement for Widows' Pension Legislation

Because family welfare workers early realized that it was a hardship to separate children from a mother who is of good character and who is prevented from caring for them only through her inability to earn a living and at the same time give them proper maternal care, it is not surprising that charity organization societies were among the pioneers in granting pensions to such mothers.[1]

This conviction of the value of keeping children with their parents or surviving parent is so much part of the warp and woof of charity organization philosophy that at least one society previous to the time of which we write had sought out families who were about to be broken up on the plea of poverty rather than wait until they might come to it. Thus a special committee of the New York Society interested in preventing the commitment of children in cases of destitution, instituted in 1898 close coöperation with the Department of Public Charities of the city.

The immediate occasion for this step had been the proposal three times embodied in bills and introduced in the Legislature that the city of New York, instead of supporting children in private institutions, should pay to parents the cost of their support and thus prevent the evils of the separation of families and of institutional life

[1] A pioneer in establishing the policy of keeping mother and child together was the Boston Society for the Relief of Destitute Mothers and Infants, of which Dr. Charles P. Putnam, for years a leader in work of the Associated Charities of Boston, and its president from 1907 until his death in 1914, was one of the founders.

for children. The Charity Organization Society, in conjunction with other societies, had opposed this legislation, not because it too did not oppose institutional care for dependent children but because it felt that great moral injury would be sure to result from such a return to "public outdoor relief."

Under the joint plan of the Department of Public Charities and the New York Society, the latter was able to visit those families where it seemed wise to deny the petition for commitment. If it appeared as a result of this examination that private assistance and encouragement would keep the family together and prevent the proposed commitment; that the home conditions were not unfavorable, and the parents or surviving parent was of good character, the superintendent of the Department was so notified, and the case was left by him for the time being in the hands of the committee of the Society.[1]

When there was immediate need, assistance was supplied at once from the Provident Relief Fund of the Society,[2] or from some other coöperating relief agency. If it had been found that a regular monthly allowance of some kind was essential, it was provided either through special appeal or by the organization of various sources of relief, when such were available. Relatives, former employees and others upon whom the family had any claim were expected to contribute their due share, and if the family had any church connection, this was also taken into account.

[1] "It is reported that in some instances parents are so anxious to keep their children that the task is easy, even though the amount of money required is considerable. The gratitude shown for the assistance through which it becomes possible to avoid the dreaded separation and the stigma of becoming a charge upon the public treasury, is ample reward for all those who have had a share in the undertaking." Anon., "Organized Charity at Work," *The Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 562 (1900).

[2] This fund supplied emergent and temporary relief in cases in which relief has to be supplied before it can be obtained from other sources, the trustees of the Provident Relief Fund standing ready to supply such emergent and temporary relief when necessary, immediately upon the report of the Society's agents.

"The society felt confident that any aid needed to prevent the breaking up of families would be granted by the community in answer to special appeals. These efforts proved that the need of separation of families on account of destitution is commonly exaggerated, that little material aid is needed to accomplish much in keeping families together, where adequate advice and personal attention is given." [1] Whether rightly or not, the size of pensions granted were not so large as to remove from the mother all necessity for supplementing the family income from the outside.[2]

Various requests from different parts of the city, especially from the district committees of the Charity Organization Society, were made for new day nurseries. Since the woman who was suddenly called upon to be both father and mother could not successfully support her children and give adequate care besides, the nurseries were asked for, to take from her shoulders part of the burden, thereby enabling her to provide for her own, and thus giving the child "its rightful heritage" and relieving "the state of the burden of support." [3]

The success of the experiment just described is attested by the fact that by 1901 there were under the care of the Society some three hundred and fifty families in which there were eight hundred children who would have been accepted as public charges except for the intervention of the Society.[4] A year later its general secretary wrote that

[1] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Supervision and Education in Charity," p. 153 (1903).

[2] Opinions differ as to whether a widow with dependent children should ever work outside the home, it being urged by some that such outside contacts in moderation are valuable.

[3] Anon., *Charities,* Vol. V, No. 24, p. 9 (1900). See also Mrs. Charles Russell (Josephine Shaw) Lowell, "Why Day Nurseries are Needed," *Charities,* Vol. IV, No. 22, pp. 1, 2 (1900).

[4] The entire number of children in these families was much greater than this, as parents usually apply for commitment of only part of their children, expecting to be able to support the remainder. See Anon., "Dependent Children in New York City," *Charities,* Vol. VI, p. 369 (1901).

it was a conservative estimate that the efforts of the four preceding years had saved to the city of New York "a round million dollars for the support of children" who were "better off in their homes, and many more than a million dollars' worth of human affection and family life and parental care, and natural relation between brother and sister, between child and parent, between the growing child and the social and industrial life of which he would so soon have an integral part." [1]

One of the most marked changes in the standards of work of charity organization societies since 1905 as already noted, has been the change of opinion as to what constitutes adequate relief. Because of the resulting increased financial burdens, the belief gradually gained currency that many charity organization societies were finding it impossible to raise enough money for the adequate provision for all widows with small children under their care. It was claimed that in many of the children's courts throughout the land homes were being broken up solely because the mother was unable to care adequately for her children. Opinions varied as to how great an extent this was true and as to the best way to meet the situation.[2] Nevertheless at a time when opinion was much divided in the country and the weight of authority within the ranks of the charity organization movement was against a return to public outdoor relief in any form, the secretary of the National Probation League [3] successfully concluded a three years' campaign in Illinois for widows' pensions

[1] Edward T. Devine, "Outdoor Relief," *Charities,* Vol. VIII, p. 377 (1902).

[2] The method of the New York Society has already been described. A unique method was adopted by the Indianapolis Society in 1908. The plan consisted in the erection of a number of small houses which were assigned rent free to widows with dependent children under their care. In connection with the individual houses certain coöperative features of housekeeping were introduced for the benefit of the mother, who had to be away from home part of each day. The experiment has not been copied elsewhere. For a brief description see annual report, Indianapolis Charity Organization Society, pp. 27-28 (1907-1908).

[3] Mr. Henry Neil.

from public funds, by securing in 1911 an amendment to the Juvenile Court law.[1] All the evils found by experience to be inherent in any plan for public outdoor relief, together with many unfavorable local conditions, seemed to beset at the beginning the administration of the Funds to Parents Act, as it was called. On December 5, 1911, Honorable Merritt W. Pinckney, Judge in the Chicago Juvenile Court, issued a call to most of the important social agencies of Chicago asking for their coöperation and moral support. As a result a permanent advisory committee was then organized, composed of the official heads of a number of them, and two additional workers who had had considerable experience in Juvenile Court problems. After several conferences these social agencies furnished to the Judge of the Juvenile Court a special committee consisting of five experienced workers whose duty it should be to examine and pass upon all applications for relief. Each member of this committee, known as the Conference Group [2] was given a commission by the Court as a voluntary probation officer, and thereby became an officer of the Court clothed with statutory authority and a part of the Probation Department. The members of this Conference Group, in addition to being trained and experienced in this work and absolutely disinterested, had at their command all the

[1] The law provides that: "If the parent or parents of such dependent or neglected child are poor and unable to properly care for the said child, but are otherwise proper guardians and it is for the welfare of such child to remain at home, the Court may enter an order finding such facts and fixing the amount of money for such child, and thereupon it shall be the duty of the County Board, through its County Agent or otherwise, to pay such parent or parents at such times as said order may designate the amount so specified for the care of such dependent or neglected child until further order of the Court."

[2] The following organizations agreed to furnish workers their expenses, the salaries coming from private sources to make it possible for them to work disinterestedly for the good of the cause and not to be swayed by political consideration of any sort: The United Charities; Jewish Aid Society (Bureau of Personal Service Department); Roman Catholic Charities; St. Vincent de Paul. The fifth official is paid jointly by several of the smaller organizations.

records of the private and public charities of the city, as well as of all the social and civic welfare organizations constituting the Advisory Board. The right of access to these records covering years of investigations and research is a very valuable asset.

From Illinois the agitation for widows' pensions spread throughout the country until, by 1920, statutes differing greatly as to details, but agreeing in principle, had been enacted in no less than forty states. In some states Commissions on the subject preceded legislation; in others popular demand placed a law on the statute books with little previous investigation.

One of the arguments in favor of widows' pensions from public funds was that relief could always be made adequate since the state, unlike private organizations, possesses unlimited resources through the power to lay taxes. In practice it has often worked quite the opposite way. Not only have pensions granted been inadequate, judged by the most enlightened standards, but often widows eligible to pensions have been placed on long waiting lists before being granted a pension. It became evident in many communities that so long as private agencies, including charity organization societies, continued to care for those families eligible for a pension, it would be easy for the state to evade the responsibility it had assumed. In one instance, at least (the Philadelphia Society), this resulted in the local society announcing that it would accept no more applications from widows eligible for care under the widows' pension act, although it would continue to help all widows then under its care. This action brought the need for more appropriations to the pension fund dramatically to the attention of the public. In a partially successful campaign for increased funds organized by the trustees of the pension fund, the local charity organization society and other social agencies of the city joined. Only by continual and persistent effort by all interested will public

funds ever be wholly adequate for the legitimate demands made upon them, and only by eternal vigilance and care on the part of the public will it be possible to maintain the high grade social case work of which the pension will ever be but a part.

Although the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work has never taken any official position for or against widows' pension legislation and the attitude of individual societies has varied, it nevertheless is true that there would have been no nation-wide movement for widows' pensions had it depended on the initiative and support of charity organization societies either individually or collectively.

Though the dangers of any form of public relief are great, the possibilities of widows' pension legislation, wisely administered, seem even greater, especially if it leads as Workmen's Compensation legislation has done, to preventive measures aiming to reduce the number of widows. On the whole question, however, it is fair to characterize the attitude of many family case workers as pragmatic. In order that the test of such legislation may be fair and final, charity organization societies generally seem to be whole-heartedly coöperating in carrying out the spirit as well as the letter of the law.

Changing Attitude Toward Public Outdoor Relief

The charity organization movement began, in part, as a protest against the methods of administration of public outdoor relief then obtaining which was viewed as a tool of unscrupulous politicians, wasteful of the taxpayers' money and pauperizing in its effects. Historically, the administration of public outdoor relief had from the beginning of the movement been foreign to the spirit and methods of charity organization.[1] The last decade,

[1] See Chapter VI. Since these early days there have been occasional anti-outdoor relief campaigns conducted by various charity organization

however has witnessed in a number of places a change of attitude toward the possibilities of a public outdoor relief system. At least, one no longer finds the aggressive and uncompromising opposition to public outdoor relief that previously obtained in charity organization circles. This has been notably true in Kansas City, Denver, St. Joseph, Dallas, Grand Rapids, Detroit, Philadelphia and Buffalo. In these places a regeneration, though with occasional lapses, has been going on. The attitude in such places is increasingly friendly toward improving the methods of administration of public relief and less insistent on its abolition.

For the first time in fifteen years municipal charities were discussed, diagnosed and remedies prescribed at the National Conference of Charities and Correction meeting in Seattle in 1913. The movement for widows' pensions, and the recent creation in many municipalities, counties and states of Departments of Public Welfare with bureaus of social service are further evidences of a changing attitude, at least in some quarters, toward applying public funds for the solution of family problems.[1] In 1918 the

societies. In the late nineties the Buffalo and Hartford societies successfully launched such campaigns. See Anon., "Charity Organization," *Charities Review,* Vol. X, p. 6 (1900), and Anon., *Charities,* Vol. VI, p. 23 (1901). For a long time public outdoor relief had been a thorn in the side of a number of social workers in Boston, being viewed as a continuing and subtle cause of pauperism. Agitation for its abolition came to a head in 1888 and again in 1901, but did not succeed. Its failure was ascribed in the latter instance to what was characterized at the time as "an unfortunate loss of faith on the part of two or three of the natural leaders of public opinion." See *Charities,* Vol. VI, p. 253.

There were always directors of the Associated Charities on both sides of the question. The president, Mr. Paine, never reached a conviction on the subject, remaining "on the fence" on this subject until the end of his life. The question has always been complicated in Boston by two facts: (1) The Massachusetts law leaves the use of public outdoor relief entirely to the discretion of the overseers and does not limit it as the New York law does to the aged and infirm; (2) In Boston alone, out of the cities and towns of the commonwealth, the indoor and outdoor relief functions of the Overseers are divided. A distinct change for the better in the administration of public outdoor relief has tended to weaken the opposition to it.

[1] To the city government of Kansas City, Missouri, belongs the distinction of having created in 1910 the first Board of Public Welfare in the country, a plan by which the various municipal welfare

American Association for Organizing Family Social Work passed resolutions urging societies to take advantage of opportunities to socialize public charities departments, and to plan divisions of work with socialized departments based on types of family problems, not on different functioning. The Association staff has taken part in two intensive surveys of public departments to help forward their socialization.

Coöperation Between Public and Private Relief

In some instances a combination of public and private relief has been put into effect. Among the first of experiments in this line was Elmira, N. Y., where, in 1906, the work of relief in the office of the overseer of the poor was reorganized. For an imperfect registration and accounting system there was substituted a complete registration and visitation of families. This resulted in 527 thorough examinations, involving 5,254 visits. Finding coöperation absolutely necessary, the churches, charities and missions of the town organized a society, now known as the Federation for Social Service, for investigation and coöperation in aiding the poor of the city. The organization had no funds of its own, but sent people for relief to the churches, charities or city, as seemed advisable. The secretary of the Federation, a trained social

activities were brought under one department of government. It is to be noted that this development in Kansas City was hastened by the failure of the local Provident Association, a survivor of the A. I. C. P. movement and the local Associated Charities to live up to their possibilities. The movement was, however, but an indication of a changing sentiment toward government action in the field of human welfare. That the government should be "the greatest social worker of all social agencies" was advocated in many quarters. Since 1910 Departments of Public Welfare have been organized in many of the larger municipalities of the country and in not a few States and counties. In 1916 the National Public Welfare League was incorporated in Missouri. Two years later not less than fifty Boards or Departments of Public Welfare had grown out of its work. Many of these Departments represent real progress, attracting to them social workers of experience and proved ability. They have not been free however from political attacks, some of which have been successful.

worker, investigated all cases for the society. Within a month's time of the organization of this new work, the Commission of Public Relief, advised by experts in the field of philanthropy, decided to discontinue the use of public funds for out-door relief and to allow the Federation to give all aid to people in their homes. Money was collected case by case as it was needed. The result well justified its decision.[1]

As the result of a reform administration the Cincinnati Society began, in 1912, to handle all relief for the city. A like plan was followed soon after by the local society in Bridgeport, Conn., and also in New London, Conn. In 1918, Grand Rapids, Mich., adopted a similar plan. Relief was granted only on the requisition of the Social Welfare Association, the private charity organization society of the city, which rendered this service free of charge. Not only material relief, but also medical care, hospital care and admissions to homes and institutions are administered in this way.[2]

The Iowa Plan of Combined Public and Private Relief

The granting of public relief in sparsely settled communities or small towns is coming to be recognized as a problem of considerable importance. The State of Iowa has become a pioneer in seeking a solution. A uniform system of public poor relief was first established for all the counties of the State. To prevent overlapping of public and private relief and to improve the quality of family work being done by the public officials, a combination plan of public and private relief with varying details was gradually worked out in six communities by the Bureau of Social Welfare of the Extension Division

[1] Francis H. McLean, "Organized Charity," *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XIX, p. 1426 (1908).

[2] "Public Relief by a Private Agency," *The Survey*, Vol. XL, p. 228 (1918).

of the State University. Under its guidance local surveys were made and advice and help given.

In one county an Associated Charities was organized. The secretary became the official investigator of all widows' pension cases. Later the secretary was appointed overseer of the poor by the Board of Supervisors. This centralization brought private relief, county poor relief, and the investigation of widows' pensions under one central board.

In another community where the local charity organization society had gone out of existence a short time previous, a Social Service League was organized, the board being composed of representatives of all federated societies. All of these societies agreed to discontinue the giving of relief, all distribution of relief to be made through the Social Service League. The County Board of Supervisors joined the League and the overseer of the poor became assistant secretary of the League. Thus the Social Service League serves as a centre for the administration of both public and private relief. Similar plans were carried out in the other communities operating under the partnership plan.[1]

The changing attitude toward public outdoor relief just noted has doubtless been due to a number of causes, not the least important of which has been the improvement of municipal government in this country during the last decade. Governmental research has become one of the outstanding social movements of the day. In part, however, the change has been one forced upon private agencies due to the increasing cost of adequate work, according to modern standards. With a more comprehensive view of what constitutes a fair standard of life, material relief gradually acquired a new dignity. The private family agency has needed to husband its resources of time and money for the adjustment of those families

[1] Bessie Averna McClenahan. The Iowa plan for the combination of public and private relief. University of Iowa monographs. Studies in social sciences, Vol. V, No. 3. (1918.)

where the investment seems to promise the greatest return.

The Municipal Charities Commission of Los Angeles

One instance remains to be noted where the swing toward governmental participation has been so complete as to submerge almost, if not entirely, the private agency. In 1913 the city of Los Angeles, at the request of the Los Angeles Conference of Social Workers, created a Municipal Charities Commission, the first of its kind in the history of the country to have general oversight of the social work of the city. Beside serving as a charities endorsement agency, the new commission was empowered:

"To encourage the formation of new private charities to meet needs that are not already provided for and to foster all worthy enterprises of a philanthropic nature and to give assistance thereto.

"To collect and preserve statistics relating to charities, conditions of life, unemployment and delinquency and to suggest means for improving the conditions producing the need of relief.

"To maintain a constant survey of the field of charities with regard to the need and the work being done in connection therewith, and to secure intelligent co-operation among all charitable and social agencies in the city to the end that a comprehensive and economical plan in philanthropy may be attained.

"To disburse all funds set apart by the city for charitable purposes and to make a report to the City Council of the work done in connection therewith.

"To receive donations, gifts or bequests to be used for charitable or philanthropic purposes and to administer any trust declared or created for any such purpose in accordance with the terms of said trust.

"To establish and maintain a bureau for the purpose of providing employment free of charge to persons applying thereto, to furnish information concerning any vacant

position, situation or employment which may come within the knowledge of said commission, to keep a register containing the names and addresses of persons who make application for employment together with the names and addresses of all persons who are seeking help and to keep a list of all positions and situations filled." By a later ordinance the solicitation of money for any philanthropic purpose was made unlawful except under a permit of the commission.

It is seen at a glance that the powers conferred on the Commission are most comprehensive, the functions assigned it being performed in most cities by two or more private organizations. The creation of the Commission brought with it a number of readjustments in the community's social equipment. In the correlation of philanthropic effort, a Council of Social Agencies was organized. The Council, an incorporated body, may conduct certain bureaus with special boards of directors appointed by the trustees of the Council. Under this plan a bureau for family social work, known as the United Charites, was created. The Board of Directors of the United Charities was authorized to raise funds from private individuals. However, a campaign started for this purpose was abandoned and city appropriations were secured. The relation of the Commission to the Central Council is direct. Representatives of social agencies endorsed by the Charities Commission may be admitted to its membership; also members at large not to exceed 10 per cent of the total number of members, the latter nominated by the Charities Commission and elected by the Council.

Several features of the Los Angeles experiment are unique. The Commission has not only the power to endorse charities, but to withold licenses making lawful any solicitation of funds. The relation of the "family" society to the Commission has evoked the following comment from one thoughtful student of the situation: "An associated charities which is entirely supported from pub-

lic funds, managed by a board which, it need scarcely be said, must in the last analysis be acceptable to the Municipal Charities Commission, is not an associated charities. Modern thinking is beginning to conceive the associated charities as a free lance, hitting anything and everybody when necessary, for the welfare of its clients and clients' neighbors. It can be controlled by no one and becomes something else the minute it becomes governmental. It's the opposition, the everlasting opposition, friendly when officials and others are doing their best, but ready to buckle on the sword, the minute the revelations of its family work require it." [1]

The experiment in Los Angeles has in many ways marked a step in advance locally over the system or lack of system that it replaced. Those however who believe that a private agency should be unhampered by the red tape of official machinery fear lest the new system fall into the pitfalls of the old system of public relief.

[1] Francis H. McLean, "Municipal Control of Charities in Los Angeles," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 401 (1915).

CHAPTER X

THE RENAISSANCE OF SOCIAL CASE WORK

[1905-1921 Concluded]

ALTHOUGH there had been slowly gathering a body of experience and to some extent a uniformity of practice in dealing with certain types of cases, such as the widow or the vagrant, there had been, previous to this time, no authoritative formulation of the technique of social case work and little public interest in it. The practice of the Boston Society still differed in some important respects from that of New York; Buffalo was like neither; Chicago differed from all three, and Denver was still different.

This does not imply that the generation that claimed Zilpha D. Smith, Fanny Ames, Josephine Shaw Lowell, Alexander Johnson and Amos G. Warner was without technique and standards. Nevertheless, in many societies the process of comparing notes, of studying critically methods of case treatment, had made little or no progress. Family social workers as a group had remained inarticulate. That the time had "come for a more definite statement of just what we are doing for needy families" [1] was voiced on more than one occasion, but workers in the field had been such "deadly doers" as to find little time for such a statement. To state principles is relatively easy and consumes little time. To give an exposition of methods is difficult and time-consuming.

[1] Homer Folks, "The Care of Needy Families in Their Homes," *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 413 (1901).

Coincident with the nationalization of the movement, there began a growing appreciation of the technique of case work. Self-questionings and a more or less open-minded acceptance of criticism and new ideas have characterized the years since. A somewhat apologetic attitude on the part of some social workers toward family work has been replaced by technical studies into its processes.

There are several reasons for this renaissance in social case work. Social work, except possibly in the smallest communities, is no longer the undifferentiated field it once was. Although prevention is still the watchword of the day, housing reform and health campaigns, need no longer claim the time and energy of family case workers, since others have now come forward to carry the burden of these important but specialized tasks. Leaders in family social work can turn with undivided attention to the basic work of their societies and to perfecting a technique for its accomplishment. However, where no other group is ready to carry on a needed activity in the field of prevention, the responsibility is still viewed as resting with the local charity organization society.

An important factor in the renaissance of social case work has been the advent of professional training schools of social work whose growth in numbers and efforts at standardization of instruction falls wholly within the period under discussion.

Possibly the most important element has been the development of a body of workers first in the Field Department of *Charities and the Commons,* and later in the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation and the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, who are primarily interested in creating standards and securing their adoption throughout the country. Through surveys, case history studies, and the publication of books, pamphlets and magazines and the printing of confidential bulletins, these organizations have

done as much to increase interest in technique and to advance its standards as any other set of factors.

Throughout, social case work has been greatly advanced by contacts with other fields. The physician and nurse, through their emphasis on the importance of sunlight, air and diet, have taught family workers a new kind of case work. Psychologists, biologists,[1] lawyers, students of standards of living,[2] and of industrial problems, and most recently the psychiatrists, have each contributed their quota to the enriching and revitalizing of the content of social case work.

Improvements in Coöperation

The outstanding improvement in technique has been in coöperation. During the past decade and a half, coöperation has become less of a paper plan and more of a habit of mind among social agencies. Before 1905, registration, one of the earliest devices introduced by charity organization for fostering coöperation had been given a fair trial in but two or three cities,[3] in spite of the fact that such a clearing-house system is the *sine qua non* of all effective coöperation. In 1906, through the mechanism of a Confidential Exchange,[4] the first clearing-house of its kind in the country, the Boston Society paved the way for coöperation among the city's social agencies such as had been unknown in the past in Boston, and was not to be dupli-

[1] For the first time in the history of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, that body listened in 1912 to a scientific outlining of the basis and program of eugenics. A recent instance of the recognition of the significance of feeblemindedness by a charity organization society is found in "A Study of Twenty-five Repeaters," made by the Charity Organization Society of Portland, Oregon.

[2] Among the first studies of standards of living was that of the Committee on Standards of Living of the New York State Conference of Charities and Correction of 1906. It had a strong and practical effect on standards of adequacy of relief in the State. This study has been followed by many others throughout the country.

[3] See Mary E. Richmond, "What Is Charity Organization?" *Charities Review*, Vol. IX, p. 497 (1900).

[4] The nature of such an Exchange has already been explained. See pp. 125-128.

cated elsewhere at the time. Following this, a large number of other charity organization societies extended the work of their registry of families so as to include in the same file the registry of families dealt with by other organizations. At first only a few social agencies registered in these exchanges, but as time went on, the number increased until they included almost every type of case working agency. The value of such exchanges has now been proven beyond disproof; its worth attested by the fact that it has since been introduced into a number of the largest cities of the land. In several communities it has seemed wise that the exchange should be run as a separate social agency, coöperatively supported by the various philanthropic organizations making use of it. In some places they are directed by civic federations or chambers of commerce. In other places, as in Boston and New York City, they are a service still rendered by the local charity organization society.

By 1915 the different exchanges in the country seemed to develop a consciousness of their own as separate and apart from the organizations which financed them, which resulted in groups of exchange secretaries meeting together for conference at the succeeding social workers' national conferences. These meetings resulted, in 1919, in the formation of an association of exchanges, which included all exchanges in the United States and Canada under the name of The American Association of Social Service Exchanges.

The aid of social service exchanges to real coöperation can hardly be exaggerated. A striking illustration is found in Detroit where social workers from forty-five social agencies using the local exchange organized, in 1917, a joint committee to promote closer coöperation and to standardize their case work.

New Standards of Treatment

The increasing attention paid by students of the social sciences to the study of what constitutes a fair or reasonable standard of life, has been reflected during the past fifteen years in the standards of treatment of many charity organization societies. Not only has recreation won a recognized place in all adequate standards of living, but it is also receiving careful study on the part of family workers, in order that it may be possible to determine just what kind of recreation will probably suit given cases.

Again, ideas of vocational guidance have changed the old haphazard placing of a boy or girl in industry. More and more, round pegs are finding round holes, and less and less are children of families under care finding themselves a few years later in blind-alley occupations.

The number of Home Economics specialists in family welfare agencies is constantly increasing. Some of them are trained in social work and, therefore, fulfill their special tasks with an intimate knowledge of the larger family problems which often have to be studied carefully and met wisely before adjustments in domestic economy can have their full effect. The result has been, in any event, a higher standard of treatment.

In short, the current view of social responsibility has laid upon the conscience of family social workers burdens which, a short time ago, they failed to recognize as their own. This is reflected in the amount of relief now considered adequate, the subject of the next paragraph.

Adequate Relief

Almost equally outstanding changes have taken place in the use of material relief as an element in treatment. About the beginning of the new century the idea seems to have been first advanced that charity organization

societies needed a scientific study of standards of living as a basis for granting relief. This would at least enable them to help all families under their oversight to live on a basis on which they would be willing that all the families of like circumstances should live. This is in marked contrast to the old English view that poor law rates or private charity should never put a family helped above that of the poorest independent family. About the same time the general secretary of the New York Society pointed out that resources for relief were "woefully inadequate." "Our use of relief," he continued, "has been most sparing and timid. I am inclined to believe that we have caused more pauperism by our failure to provide for the necessaries of life, for the education and training of children, and for the care and convalescence of the sick, than we have by excessive relief, even if we include the indiscriminate alms." [1]

The outcome of the general growth of these convictions has been an effort, on the one hand, to stimulate studies of family budgets, and the appointment by charity organization societies of committees on Home Economics, and on the other hand, to increase the amounts of money relief granted to families when such is a needed element in treatment.

This, along with other factors, resulted almost immediately in greatly increasing the budgets of charity organization societies generally. In 1907 the budget of the Minneapolis Society was $14,000. Five years later it had risen to $55,000. To take a more recent illustration,—the budget of the Philadelphia Society had risen from $78,000 in 1912-13 to approximately $220,000 for the year ending September 30, 1918. Nearly $120,000 of this increase represented expenditures for material relief which advanced from $18,000 in 1913 to approximately $136,000 in 1919, an increase in seven years of more

[1] See Frederic Almy, quoting Edward T. Devine in article on "Constructive Relief," *The Survey*, Vol. XXVII, p. 1265 (1911).

than 600 per cent. While expenditures for administration have increased, they have by no means kept pace with the rate of increase of the amount spent for relief.

The causes for these remarkable increases in material relief are numerous. The various social problems being attacked by numerous new social movements called attention to many phases of adequate treatment previously overlooked. The growth in coöperation, especially through social service bureaus, just noted, constantly turned up cases that would otherwise probably have never reached many a local charity organization society. The follow-up work on cases reported by other organizations, especially in the health field, still further swelled the volume of new work. In short, the rise in standards of living, the passage of child labor acts and of laws regulating the work of women, the limitation of home work, the emphasis upon the care of children by their mothers in the campaign for the reduction of infant mortality, the importance of an adequate dietary in the treatment of tuberculosis, the introduction of the scientific minimum budget for families,—all these things, coupled with the rapid increase in the cost of living, enormously increased the demands upon charity organization societies.

In the matter of relief, the last decade has witnessed another important change. At the beginning of the charity organization movement it was necessary to safeguard standards which were then for the first time brought to public notice. Though not relief-giving agencies, they, therefore, organized whatever relief they thought necessary. Later, as has been seen, many charity organization societies either gave from their own funds or raised it case by case, believing that a "complete separation of relief giving from other lines of restorative effort in behalf of a needy family is unnatural and to some extent impossible." [1] For one reason or another, other social agencies

[1] Anon., *Charities,* Vol. IX, p. 18 (1902).

began thinking of their local charity organization society as the relief agency of the community, and began turning to it as a common relief pocketbook. This is a position which historically these societies never claimed and which, with the increasing costs of adequate relief-giving, just noted, has become untenable during the past decade. The budget for adequate relief alone of any American city of size would swamp a social agency attempting to carry it. Fortunately, with the development of the technique of social case work and the growth of standards quite generally among social agencies, this is less and less necessary. Charity organization societies, believing, as always, that relief, though important, is nevertheless but incidental in good case work, generally hold the view that each agency doing case work can best raise and most intelligently administer whatever relief may be needed in individual cases.

Improvement in Technique of Social Diagnosis

In the light of the new studies in the technique of social diagnosis, it is apparent that much that was labeled "investigation" in the past was such in name only. As the relation of poverty first to one factor and then another has been emphasized, one change after another has taken place in methods of social diagnosis which in toto have amounted to a revolution. Three such factors have been stressed during the period under review. The emphasis on the relationship of poverty to physical disease embodied first in the hospital social service movement, markedly influenced case work by "medicallizing" it. The introduction of the Binet-Simon tests has given case workers a new tool for diagnosing some otherwise baffling types of cases previously unrecognized as subnormal because so near the border-line. The new psychology and psychiatry are to-day causing still another revolution in methods of social diagnosis. Much case

work is now seen to involve adjusting the mentally maladjusted individual to his or her environment. Case work is spoken of in some quarters as "the art of untangling and reconstructing the twisted personality" in such a manner that the individual can adjust himself to his environment. Certain it is that a knowledge of mental hygiene is becoming part of the equipment of all case workers. The establishment of psychopathic clinics is leading to observable improvement in standards of diagnosis and treatment on the part of family case workers. To-day the movement for psychiatric social work, though new, is well recognized and fast becoming established. The demand for case workers with psychiatric training far outruns the supply.

Although psychiatric social work emphasizes the problem of the individual who is unadjusted to his environment, such lack of adjustment is not viewed as a moral defect. Moreover, leaders in the charity organization movement have not lost sight of the environment that is maladjusted to the individual. This is the basis of their continuing interest in health and housing campaigns and their growing sense of the responsibility for improving industrial conditions.[1] Increasingly throughout the period the dominant note is a demand for social justice rather than for charity.

"The only generalization," writes a former secretary of the New York Society, "which it is safe to make about the dependent poor is that they are poor. Devotion to ideals, heroic sacrifice, stern self-denial, unflagging persistence and whatever other virtue you choose to name, are to be found among the poor, and a full assortment of the common failings of the race is theirs also. The differentiating factors are economic rather than moral, or religious, social rather than personal, accidental and re-

[1] See Stockton Raymond, "Case Work and Industrial Standards," pp. 394-400, Proceedings, National Conference of Social Work, 46th session (1919). See also Fred Johnson, "Unemployment from the Angle of Case Work," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXV, pp. 162-163 (1915).

mediable rather than fundamental." [1] The new view holds that the poor as a class are the moral equals of the rich as a class.[2]

It should be borne in mind that the direct connection between bad economic and social conditions and poverty was first seen mainly by the leaders in the charity organization movement, those who could see the forest in spite of the trees. The close connection apparently has not been appreciated by many who contribute financially to the movement, nor by some of the rank and file.

Because *sometimes,* though not always, or even a majority of times, certain personal qualities necessary for success are lacking in clients, family case workers do not lose sight of the so-called "character element" in treatment. To undermine self-reliance, to pauperize, is still the unpardonable sin in family case work.

The renaissance of case work also brought with it a growing appreciation of the modifications of methods necessary when working with groups with differing racial backgrounds. A more careful study of the psychology of the immigrant and an appreciation of his cultural contributions to America, characterizes the newer and better standards of case work to-day. This has been made the more necessary, as it was in the nineties, that the tide of immigration definitely shifted from northwest to south and southeastern Europe. The results of this change began to affect case workers during the years under review. Good case work with peoples least like ourselves requires special aptitudes and training.

The causes of the improvement in the technique of social diagnosis just noted are threefold. First, the develop-

[1] Edward T. Devine, "Social Forces," *Charities and the Commons,* Vol. XXI, p. 141 (1908).

[2] At a meeting held in New York City under the auspices of the Society for Sanitary and Moral Prophylaxis, October 16, 1913, Dr. Richard C. Cabot of the Massachusetts General Hospital declared that judging from his field of observation, if any comparison could be made in regard to the morality of the rich and poor, the comparison would be favorable to the poor.

ment of those sciences which throw light on problems of human behavior, notably Economics, Sociology, Biology, and especially, Psychology. Important additions were made to the body of knowledge in each of these related fields just before or during the years here surveyed.

Especially important for purposes of social diagnosis has been the change in methodology of studying the so-called causes of poverty. The case counting method has been abandoned. The vitiating personal equation, largely ignored in the earlier methods, is now reduced to a minimum. Instead of listing "causes" in the order of their importance, the more scientific phrases, "adverse conditions present" or "problems presented" are used.[1]

Second, the intersection of social movements. The development of a number of distinct movements, each for the elimination of a specific evil, such as bad housing, tuberculosis, vice, overwork, etc., has opened the eyes of an army of case workers to the part these evils play in pushing families over the poverty line or out of social adjustment. After all, case workers, in common with others, see what has been most forcibly brought to their attention.

Third, research in the field of case work. The new contributions of the sciences just noted and the implications of the interrelations of social movements would have remained largely unutilized by social workers had it not been for the research of those primarily interested in case work. The studies and researches of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, culminating in the publication of Social Diagnosis, by Mary E. Richmond, and of the Social Work Series under her editorship, is illustrative. Such research has been further enriched by contributions from the technical training schools of social work.

Of the principles with which the movement began, none

[1] See Lilian Brandt, "The Causes of Poverty," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. XXIII (1908). See also Edward T. Devine, "Misery and Its Causes" (1913).

has received greater emphasis during this period than that of volunteer service. One might almost say that the last decade has witnessed the rediscovery of the volunteer. For a while emphasis was placed on the professional paid worker. This was necessary to establish standards of work. It, however, has become increasingly clear that while the professional worker is an essential, there is constant need for the services of trained volunteers. This is true not only because of the amount of work to be done but also because, as has been pointed out,[1] a volunteer can often render services which the professional cannot, and each volunteer, trained in the standards of good case work, is a center from which radiate forces intelligently moulding public opinion. This should not be taken to mean that in many places, as great use of volunteers has been made as is possible or that there has not been great dissatisfaction with the status of that form of volunteer service known as friendly visiting. This has been true even in cities with societies of the oldest standing.[2] It is fair, however, to say that even where this distrust is found, there is still faith in the possibilities of friendly visiting.[3] The passing of the years has seemed to indicate that a corps of effective visitors can be developed wherever the problem has been intelligently and energetically attacked, with perseverance and patience.

In addition to improvements in the work of charity organization societies for their clients, certain improvements in internal operation and relationship to the public should be noted. The Exchange Branch, a group of

[1] See pp. 148, 149.

[2] See Porter R. Lee, "A Visitor to the Boston Visitors," *Charities and the Commons,* Vol. XVI, p. 589 (1906). See also the Thirty-third Annual Report, Brooklyn Bureau of Charities, p. 37 (1912).

[3] This has led in Chicago to the organization recently of a group of Good Neighbors in connection with the work of Lower North District of the United Charities. It has the advantage of the democratic and natural relationship found in the Block Workers of the Social Unit of Cincinnati. See Mrs. John J. O'Conner, "Tapping New Reservoirs," *The Survey,* Vol. XXXIX, pp. 655-656 (1918).

twenty-four charity organization societies banded together to exchange monthly forms, the Financial Exchange, for the interchange of financial methods and results, the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation and the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, have each in turn or jointly during the past fifteen years, greatly improved the office management of charity organization societies, including methods of record keeping and statistics.[1]

Almost equally marked improvement is to be noted in the matter of publicity. The older scrappy types of annual reports have in the main been replaced by ones of greater attractiveness and educational value, while certain societies have endeavored with considerable success to popularize through exhibits and bulletins the gospel of social case work.

The Work of Charities Endorsement

A concomitant of any system of private benevolence is usually a certain amount of imposition on the charitably inclined by persons and agencies that masquerade behind the name of charity. Gross inefficiency and misdirected energy, as well as fraud, create the need for a piece of social machinery which can help transmute benevolence into beneficence. This is the function of "charities endorsement" which, though it had its origin earlier, has had its main development in the last two decades. It is not surprising that the giving public should have first looked to charity organization societies to render this service. In 1897 the New York Society engaged a special agent whose sole duty was to supply to inquirers confidential reports regarding any particular charitable enterprise. The work is still carried on by the Society through

[1] See especially Charity Organization Statistics, Report of the Committee on Statistics of the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity (1915).

its Bureau of Advice and Information which stands ready to "furnish upon request a detailed and confidential report regarding any charity in the city." More recently this Bureau arranged to extend its service to the members of the Merchants' Association, one of the more influential and active commercial bodies in the city. The thirty-five hundred business houses on its rolls form a large percentage of the contributors to charity in New York. These contributors, together with the 7,000 subscribers to the Charity Organization Society, make a nucleus of an interested body of contributors of considerable size and influence.

In 1914-15 the Bureau of the New York Society put into operation a novel plan which provides for the gratuitous auditing of the accounts of any of the city's 2,000 charitable organizations which desire it.[1] The work of auditing is done by the students of the School of Commerce, Accounts and Finance of New York University, as part of their university work. The value of this cooperative plan to both the Society and the University, whose students receive practical work in accounting, has been such that it has been copied by the School of Commerce of the University of Denver and by the University of Pittsburgh.

In Chicago, where charities endorsement was early developed, the work was, for a number of years, undertaken by the Bureau of Charities, until transferred by it, in 1911, to the local Association of Commerce. Still other cities, as in Boston, began with and continue using a special committee of the local charity organization society to furnish information about its local charities.

In a number of places the feeling soon developed that it was unwise and illogical, to place upon the shoulders of one social agency the responsibility for passing judgment on its sister agencies. The practice of charities

[1] At present fully one-third of the 2000 institutions do not have their accounts audited by certified public accountants, their plea being that their funds are not sufficient to warrant this expenditure.

endorsement by a non-charitable body was first instituted in Cleveland, where the custom had grown up among some of the social agencies of hiring successful collection agents and giving them, in some instances, exorbitant commissions. By 1901 the Chamber of Commerce, interested in the increasing demands which were being made on local business men for charitable contributions, appointed a committee of ten, on benevolent associations.

The Chamber of Commerce immediately followed up the work of its committee by conducting an investigation of the character of the work done by the various benevolent institutions of the city. To those that it considered legitimate it supplied certificates of approval, and members confined their contributions to institutions having such certificates. The interest thus manifested by the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce in the work of the local charities has had, as will be seen, a marked influence on the subsequent charitable development of the city.[1]

Since 1901 the principle of charities endorsement has been adopted in a number of communities. By 1910 Cincinnati, Cleveland, Grand Rapids, Indianapolis, Lincoln, Los Angeles,[2] Milwaukee, Omaha, Peoria, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Seattle, Wheeling, Worcester and Youngstown had endorsement bureaus, managed wholly or in part by commercial organizations, while many other cities had

[1] Speaking editorially of the work of charities endorsement of the Chamber of Commerce, *Charities and the Commons* (Vol. XXI, p. 957, 1909) says, "So effective has been its work that not only members of the Chamber but the whole community relies upon it. Without its card, an organization cannot raise funds sufficient for maintenance. The supervision of the committee is continuous and has been a strong factor in increasing the efficiency of charity work."

Writing in 1911, Mr. Francis H. McLean adds, the Cleveland Associated Charities and the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce have already furthered "such a degree of common understanding among the many organizations in Cleveland that the whole social fabric reveals a closer union of work and effort than in probably any other city of its size." *The Survey*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 745, 746 (1911). For further developments see pp. 429-433 of the present study.

[2] In Los Angeles the Municipal Charities Commission conducts the investigation and endorsement of local philanthropic agencies. See Anon., *The Survey*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 1-2 (1913).

the subject under consideration.[1] Through the efforts of the Buffalo Society, the local Chamber of Commerce created, in 1911, a Committee on Supervision of Local Charities and Survey of Social and Industrial Conditions, and engaged a special secretary to take charge of the work. In 1912 the Denver Chamber of Commerce created a Charities Endorsement Committee modeled after similar committees in the large eastern cities. "Charities Endorsement as a function of commercial organizations" was a brand new topic at the 1913 meeting of the National Conference of Charities and Correction. The last of the metropolitan cities to establish an endorsement committee was Philadelphia, when, in 1915, the local Chamber of Commerce established a Charities Bureau in charge of a full-time secretary. With the advent of a Welfare Federation in Philadelphia this function was transferred to the new organization.

Community Planning in Social Work

The great and growing number of unrelated private social agencies in the larger cities of the country characterizing the past twenty years of social work in America,[2] has presented a problem which many communities are trying to solve by one method or another. The history of these efforts to solve the individualistic alignment of social agencies and to introduce community planning in social work will some day be written. Its beginnings are, however, so intertwined with the charity organization movement that some brief mention of it must here be made.

When social work was largely an undifferentiated field and largely limited to social case work, there was ob-

[1] See special report on Charities Endorsement to the Executive Committee of the Association of Commerce of Chicago (1910).

[2] See Mary E. Richmond, "Philadelphia Charities: Their Activities and Needs," *Charities*, Vol. XI, p. 240 (1903).

viously less need of a central body reviewing the general situation in the social field and planning for community improvements and new lines of work. Not only the multiplication of social agencies, but also the gradual realization that the family rather than the community is and is going to be increasingly the unit of work of charity organization societies has called for some new means of coordinating all the social forces of a community. There was an earlier period in the history of the movement as has been seen when charity organization societies assumed more or less consciously that they were responsible to a large degree for community organization and for practical leadership in movements for the improvement of social conditions. The need of more thorough work in the field of family welfare and the general social awakening providing new workers for the field of community organization has led to this important division of labor.

For some time the conviction had been growing that social agencies must do more than was right in its own eyes, in other words, that they owed obligations to others working in the same field.[1] The budding professional consciousness of social workers, coupled with a groping desire to view the general situation in the social field, had already led to the organization of social workers' clubs in Boston and New York, at whose meetings many community problems were discussed. Even before this the seed for community thinking and planning had been planted by the general conferences organized in many places by the local charity organization society as in the case of the Assembly, organized by the Philadelphia Society early in the history of the movement.[2] Later conferences under more general auspices came into being. As early as 1901 a number of social workers of St. Louis

[1] Mary E. Richmond, "Some Methods of Charitable Co-operation," *Charities*, Vol. VII, p. 196 (1901).

[2] See pp. 191, 192. See also Francis H. McLean, *Charity Organization Field Work*, a pamphlet published by the National Association of Societies for Organizing Charity, pp. 22-23 (1910).

organized with good results a monthly conference for mutual instruction as to the charitable resources of the city and for the promotion of further coöperation.[1]

In 1908, largely through the efforts of the local Associated Charities, the Charity Conference Committee of Los Angeles (later Los Angeles Conference of Social Workers) was organized to coördinate the efforts of the different charitable societies and institutions of the city. As a monthly forum for the discussion of community problems it was of great value. It led to the creation of a Municipal Charities Commission, to which reference has been made.

The City Conference Plan

In 1910 the New York City Conference of Charities and Correction was organized.[2] It is open to all who are officially connected with public or private charitable or correctional work in New York City or who take an active interest therein. No membership fee is charged, the expenses being met by voluntary contributions. Convening annually since 1910, it has proven of great service in working out community programs. That the conference has not proven superfluous is attested by the fact that "probably 95 per cent of those attending the three days' session rarely, if ever, attend a state or national conference." [3] From New York the City Conference idea has spread to other cities. In spite of the possibilities of the general conference it is not well adapted to the needs of smaller communities. "They sufficed in the large cities," writes Mr. McLean, "because there were other general agencies also interested in social progress,

[1] See Anon., *Charities,* Vol. VII, p. 347 (1901) and Vol. XIII, p. 478 (1904).

[2] In 1889 the Charity Organization Society of Baltimore had organized a two-days' conference on local charities. Subjects pertaining to the prevention of pauperism and crime were discussed. The conference did not, however, develop into an annual institution as in New York City.

[3] See Anon., *The Survey,* Vol. XXXIV, p. 253 (1915).

and it would have been, and is, exceedingly dangerous for any one to pretend to map out a social program in its entirety under such conditions." [1]

The Central Council of Social Agencies

The form of organization for group action by social agencies that seems destined to commend itself, especially to communities in which there is considerable development of organized activity friendly but unrelated, is the central council of social agencies, a delegate body representing the social agencies of a city, these agencies still maintaining independence of action in all fields and being bound together by coöperative rather than contractual relationships. The delegates are therefore armed with advisory and influencing powers only, and have no direct administrative sphere excepting as concerns its own internal affairs.[2] Such a body could well work out a social chart or goal of community endeavor. It "might plan the social program on the basis of joint action in public reforms, and on the basis of morally influencing particular organizations to undertake particular activities, or encouraging the growth of new societies whenever required." [3]

The Central Council idea [4] had its inception at the time of the launching of the Pittsburgh Associated Charities in 1908. As has been said, a number of social agencies of the city united to form an Associated Charities to be financed by them jointly. Each member organization also appointed a delegate to a Central Council which in

[1] Francis H. McLean, *Charity Organization Field Work,* published by the National Association of Societies for Organizing Charity, p. 23 (1910).

[2] The Central Council idea should not be confused with the discredited plan of organization, known as the St. Paul plan, see p. 243.

[3] Francis H. McLean, *Charity Organization Field Work,* published by the National Association of Societies for Organizing Charity, pp. 24-25 (1910).

[4] The idea seems to have originated with Mr. Francis H. McLean, who has done more than any one else to foster its development.

turn named ten of the twenty-one members of the Board of Trustees of the newly created "A. C." This latter relationship between the Council and the Associated Charities proved unfortunate for reasons already stated [1] and was later terminated. The Council as a Council, however, soon carried on remarkably successful educational campaigns in the child welfare and public health fields. The Central Council, later operated by the Associated Charities as an open forum for the discussion of social problems of common interest to the social agencies of the city, though pointing the way for other cities to strive towards unity of purpose and combined plans, was destined to become virtually a city conference.

The spread of the central council idea, perfected by one bit of experience after another, has since been rapid. Milwaukee organized a Council in 1909. Beside creating a number of needed social agencies, it was responsible for the reorganization of the local Associated Charities upon a modern basis. A Central Council was soon after organized in Rochester, New York, where the council occupies the peculiar position of being the executive board of the United Charities, electing the executive committee which manages this society's work. The Central Philanthropic Council of Columbus was organized in 1910 after a survey made by Francis H. McLean, at that time field secretary of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation. As is more usual, the local charity organization society became, without compensation, general-secretary of the Council.[2] St. Louis, the first of the metropolitan cities to organize, followed in 1911 on a plan also drafted by Mr. McLean. It made, in 1916, under his direction as general-secretary of the American Association of Societies for Organizing

[1] See p. 343.

[2] With the exception of Milwaukee which employed the general-secretary of the local Associated Charities on half time the Councils had in their beginnings no paid service. The employment of paid full-time secretaries has been a later development.

Charity, a most comprehensive survey of public and private social agencies, resulting in a genuine interest in standards of work among the social agencies of the city.[1]

Councils followed in Cincinnati, Portland, Oregon; and Seattle, Washington. In the last two, the Councils did not long remain active as Councils, the one in Seattle assuming more the nature of a city conference. The Council in Cincinnati, along with accomplishing many things associated with Central Councils, fostered contractual relationships by arranging for joint money-raising for a number of its larger organizations and so also partakes somewhat of the nature of a Financial Federation to which reference will shortly be made.

Chicago was the next metropolitan city to organize an active non-contractual council. Through informal case conferences for case work societies, it emphasized at the start the importance of systematic attempts to develop better standards and methods of work in the fields of family and child welfare. Minneapolis, after the repeated urgings of the general-secretary of local Associated Charities, organized a Council in 1913. It, together with the Springfield Conference, as it is called, organized soon after as a direct result of the Springfield Survey,[2] concentrated on developing standards of work as its first task. The first Council of any strength in a community of less than 50,000 population was organized in Columbia, S. C. More recently Councils have been organized in St. Paul, Minn., and East St. Louis.[3] In practically all instances, as has been seen, the movement for some such coördinating body in the field of community planning as a Central Council had its origin in the charity organization move-

[1] See Anon., "St. Louis Self-Survey of Social Service," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 493 (1917).

[2] A survey of the charities of the city made under the direction of the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity.

[3] This is not an exhaustive list of Councils. It includes the more important and active ones. Councils have been started in several other places but to date appear to be largely paper organizations only.

ment, either nationally or locally. That this should have been so is the logical result of the tendency already noted for family welfare societies to stress community responsibility for community problems and to concentrate increasingly on the job of raising standards in the narrower field of family social work.

Financial Federation

Central Councils of Social Agencies, as has just been seen, in the main came into being to develop an esprit de corps among social agencies that would result in higher standards of work for each, the elimination of duplicating efforts and the meeting of community needs either not met, or at best inadequately met. The problem of the adequate financing of social work and the evil of the inbreeding of support, play little or no part in their program. To meet these problems, or problem, since they are largely inseparable, federations of finance bearing one title or another, but all providing for a joint collection of funds, have gradually evolved in a number of cities.

The first of these, that of Denver, Colorado, antedates the period of history covered by this chapter.[1] With this exception, and an experiment by the Washington Society,[2] the movement for joint financing has fallen within the period since 1905.[3] The forerunner of the present movement for joint financing was Elmira, N. Y., where, in 1906, as already described, the churches, charities and missions of the town organized a society, since known as the Federation for Social Service, for investigation and coöperation in aiding the poor of the city.[4]

[1] See pp. 240-243.

[2] The experiment was along the lines of co-operative financing. A joint committee representing the Associated Charities, the Citizens' Relief Association and the Committee on Prevention of Consumption sent out 13,000 appeals personally addressed. See Francis H. McLean, "Organized Charity," *Charities and the Commons*, Vol. XIX, p. 1271 (1907).

[3] The Financial Federation plan has since 1900 been a characteristic of Jewish Philanthropy in America. They have been pioneers in the field. See Boris D. Bogen, "Jewish Philanthropy" (1917).

[4] See pp. 401, 402 for a further description of this federation.

The Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philanthropy [1]

Although various motives led to the organization, in 1913 of The Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philanthropy, the main purpose of this first of the larger existing Federations was to secure, in an efficient manner, adequate financial support for the various social agencies of the city which, including the Associated Charities, had for some time experienced increasing difficulty in securing funds for maintaining, much less developing, their work. The charities endorsement work of the city had been instituted by the committee on benevolent associations of the Chamber of Commerce in 1900. In 1908 the committee had made a careful investigation of the whole of the city's giving during the year 1907, and in 1910 a similar study of the whole situation for 1909.[2] The suggestions of the committee, based on the conclusions of these studies and on its experience as the charities endorsement agency of the city, led to the establishment of the aforementioned Federation for Charity and Philanthropy to participation in which any organization is eligible which makes to the citizens of Cleveland, without restriction to religious, denominational or other special affiliation, a legitimate appeal for funds with which to further its activities.

Federation subscribers were not to be solicited for current expenses by any of the organizations in the Fed-

[1] The name is now Welfare Federation of Cleveland.

[2] It was found in 1909 that seventy-three institutions were attacking the problem of social betterment from almost every possible angle. They owned endowments worth nearly $4,000,000. They were taking the full time of several hundred people and were calling for the annual expenditure of one and one-half millions of dollars—a sum equal to $3 for every man, woman and child of Cleveland. They were asking each year for direct contributions of about $1 per citizen, or roughly $650,000. It was further found that that sum was contributed by but 5,386 persons or less than 1% of Cleveland's population. Of this number six people were giving 42%; 54 people were giving 55%; 253 persons were giving nearly three-fourths of all the money contributed. See footnote p. 240 for similar findings in Liverpool in 1873.

eration. *Current expenses only* were solicited by the Federation; before soliciting funds for other needs, federated organizations were expected to consult with the Federation Board. Gifts for such needs were forwarded by the Federation on request. Gifts were forwarded in line with designation of givers to any Cleveland organization, whether listed as a member of the Federation or not.

Briefly stated, the Federation became "an alliance of fifty-three of the city's social organizations to collect all funds for the current expenses of the fifty-three institutions by means of one central board rather than through individual organizations; to put into use each year the $30,000 to $60,000 which is now spent in making fifty-three collections where henceforth only one will be necessary; to enable officers of organizations to devote to actual work time now devoted to securing funds; to free benevolent donors, by one collection, the annoyance of incessant demands for small amounts; to double or triple, through educational campaigns, the number of the city's givers to charity; and to cause fifty-three little skirmishing bands of out-fighters to bury their differences, unite their interests and sympathies, and present a solid front to the problems of the community." [1]

The year following (1914) Cleveland took a further step toward consolidating its social agencies by uniting practically all the welfare organizations, both public and private, of the city, under the name of the Cleveland Welfare Council.[2] The purpose of this federation of fed-

[1] Anon., "Put the 'Cleave' in 'Cleaveland,'" *The Survey*, Vol. XXX, p. 447 (1913).

[2] Regular membership in the council was of organizations or institutions. The initial members include the following: Chamber of Commerce, Federation for Charity and Philanthropy, Cleveland Foundation, Federated Churches, Federation of Women's Clubs, Catholic Diocese, Academy of Medicine, Western Reserve University, Case School of Applied Science, Federation of Jewish Charities, City Club, Civic League and Chamber of Industry.

Ex officio members were the following named officers or their representatives: Judge of Juvenile Court, presiding judge of the Common

erations was to provide clearing-house facilities through discussion, committees, files of social data and the like, for the interchange of information, ideas and plans relative to community welfare, with a view to preventing duplicated or unrelated efforts on the part of social agencies or individuals and to recommending to proper agencies or individuals needed welfare activities.

In 1916 the Cleveland Welfare Council and the Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philanthropy merged into a new all-comprehensive organization entitled the Cleveland Welfare Federation. To the fifty-seven federated organizations, including most of the voluntary philanthropies of Cleveland making a general appeal for funds, were thus added practically all agencies, public and private, philanthropic, charitable, civic or semi-civic, interested in the common welfare.

The new body has a general board made up of two delegates chosen by each constituent agency. These delegates represent both board members and givers and paid workers. This body holds quarterly meetings for the discussion of policies, improved methods and new movements, and is a sort of town-meeting assembly for social service matters. At its annual meeting this general board elects twenty-four trustees of the Welfare Federation, one-third of whose terms expire each year. In addition, six are elected by the trustees themselves. These thirty trustees are responsible for the work of the federation, which is carried on through the paid office staff and committees. These details are here given for Cleveland, as the methods of appointment in the different federations, though varying somewhat, are built on this general principle.

Pleas Court, judge of Probate Court, chief justice of Municipal Court, the mayor, the director of public welfare, the commissioner of research and publicity, the director of schools, superintendent of schools, the president of the Board of Education, the public librarian and the state factory inspector.

The executive committee had power to elect, in addition, ten representatives at large to serve for a period of one year.

This Cleveland plan has brought to light some significant features of charity giving. First, the federation plan tends to make a person's gifts larger than the aggregate of his gifts to the separate organizations;[1] second, it reaches persons who have never contributed to any social agency; third, the cost of collecting is materially less; and fourth, it is possible, through combined efforts, to give a more thorough-going course in social education.[2] The first of these facts is demonstrated when one compares the subscriptions received by the Federation for Charity and Philanthropy in 1913 with the gifts made by the same persons in 1912. Those who gave $126,735 in 1912 gave in 1913 directly and by Federation subscription blanks, $199,614, a gain of 57.5 per cent.[3] The total contributions for the third year showed an increase of $100,000 over the year before. The second point is demonstrated by the addition of over 5,000 new givers in the first two and a half years of its existence.[4]

Although the Cleveland plan owes its origin to the need on the part of social agencies for adequate and steady income on the one hand, and the desire of business men to be free from the importunities of countless solicitors on the other, the Federation workers, almost from the beginning, seemed to believe the real organizing principle of the so-called financial federation to be "a thorough-going plan of coöperation between the recognized social agencies of a given community in their entire program,

[1] "Nearly everyone thinks he is giving more to charity than he really is." Anon., "Put the 'Cleave' in 'Cleaveland,'" *The Survey,* Vol. XXX, p. 448 (1913).

[2] "Separately the organizations could not do it; together they can. A single organization could scarcely afford to carry on such a campaign because it would have no assurance that all or even a large part of the returns would come into its own coffers. Other agencies, which had not helped in the education, would share the benefit. The federation, however, may do it with the certainty that every ounce of energy it puts forth in quickening the community conscience will come back to it in dollars." *Ibid.,* p. 448.

[3] See the "Social Year Book," published by The Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philanthropy, p. 15 (1913).

[4] Anon., "Charity Federation and Its Fruits," *The Survey,* Vol. XXXVI, p. 188 (1916).

financial, educational and social." [1] Accordingly, conferences have been held for developing higher standards of practice in common problems; studies have been directed toward the elimination of difficulties presented by such problems as immigration and vagrancy. A committee on methods and coöperation "to study constituent agencies, coöperate with them, develop standards and correlate activities" was organized with the assistant secretary of the Federation, a former charity organization worker, as chairman.

The Cleveland experiment, differing from other previous plans involving the principle of a joint appeal for funds,[2] is thus more than a fiscal enterprise in that it regards as fundamental the tenet "that action should be based on a knowledge of facts and conditions. This procedure is to secure as accurate knowledge as possible of community plans and problems and work that needs to be done, also to get the facts about the agencies and resources that are available to do the work." [3] In short, the Cleveland plan aims to have the whole community "pool all its resources of time, energy, intelligence, vision, sentiment and inspiration in the attempt to solve the problem of human welfare" [4] in the city of to-day.[5]

[1] Roscoe C. Edlund, "The Social Service of a Federation," Proceedings, National Conference of Social Work, 46th session, p. 717 (1919).

[2] "The plan proposed differs in essential points from any devised or practiced in any other city. It is not a federation of institutions alone, as in Denver; not of givers alone, nor of both together. It is a federation for advancing charity and philanthropy, of institutions of givers and of citizens. It does not intend to be a mere collecting agency, as is the Liverpool project, though it does not wish to assume to direct gifts to this or that work until it has had at least two years of experience, and then only on the request of the individual contributor. It hopes to produce its results in the way of a wiser distribution mainly through a better educated giver, rather than through its own action." C. W. Williams, "Clevèland's Group Plan," *The Survey,* Vol. XXIX, p. 606 (1913).

[3] Sherman C. Kingsley, "War Chests in Peace Times," *The Survey,* Vol. XLII, p. 345, (1919).

[4] The "Social Year Book," p. 20 (1913), published by The Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philanthropy.

[5] "Federation workers are no more interested in finances detached from the vital work of the social service field than is a case committee of a

The movement for federating charitable agencies soon spread to other sections of the country. By June, 1916, no less than eleven cities had financial federations.[1] Among the most successful of these were the Council of Social Agencies in Cincinnati; the Erie Social Service Federation, formed in 1914, comprising all of the leading charities of the city; the Baltimore Alliance of Charitable and Social Agencies, formed in 1915, with eleven constituent societies, and the General Welfare Association of Oshkosh. The common experience in each of the four communities was that a single annual campaign for money was more remunerative than all the separate campaigns conducted by the various societies put together.[2] In 1913, when Cleveland adopted the federation plan, Denver, where twenty-five years earlier a federation had been organized which for various reasons had failed to live up to its possibilities, took new courage, and shortly thereafter reorganized her federation on a more modern basis. Several years later a full-time secretary, experienced in federation work, was employed for the first time. Since then the Federation has been growing in public favor and influence. In the past few years the federation movement has gained new recruits in both

C. O. S. interested exclusively in material relief."—Sherman C. Kingsley, "War Chests in Peace Times," *The Survey*, Vol. XLII, p. 344 (1919).

It was declared of the plan by one of its promoters that it would be a failure:

"1. If it does not raise more money;

2. If it diminishes the personal quality in charity, even though twice as much money is raised;

3. If the Federation does not have the courage to divert money to work where it is greatly needed and fails to persuade organizations to abandon fields better covered by others;

4. If it fails to build up weak organizations whose work gives prospect of service to the community;

5. If it does not stimulate new organizations to meet new needs." See C. W. Williams, Cleveland's "Group Plan," *The Survey*, Vol. XXIX, p. 603 (1913).

[1] Four other cities had abandoned federations once begun. The above list of eleven cities mentioned as having Charity Federations does not include cities in which the Jewish Charities have been federated.

[2] Anon., "Charity Federation and Its Fruits," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 187 (1916).

smaller and larger communities, the most noteworthy of the latter being Grand Rapids, Mich., and Philadelphia.

The Cincinnati Council of Social Agencies undertook as one of its first activities a survey of all contributions to philanthropy offering its information and advice to all large and prospective givers, permanent endowments, memorials or legacies. It was in 1915 but a step from this to conducting the campaign for a joint collection of funds for a number of important agencies to which reference has been made. More recently the Central Council of Social Agencies of Minneapolis became a participating member of a Town Tea Kettle, a form of joint collection of funds. Since then St. Paul has organized a Community Chest as the result of a six months' investigation of a joint committee representing the St. Paul Association of Public and Business Affairs and the Central Council of Social Agencies. As has just been seen, the Cleveland Federation soon found the making of budgets and the planning of work with emphasis on community needs and standards of work an essential of federation practice. For this reason the Federation in Grand Rapids has added an advisory council, consisting of two representatives of each agency in the Federation, one of whom is required by the by-laws to be an executive officer of the agency and the other a member of the administrative staff, but not a trustee. Still more recently the Welfare Federation of Philadelphia has organized a Council of Social Agencies as an essential part of its work. It would thus seem that financial federation tends towards functional federation and in time functional federation to some kind of financial federation. At any rate, by 1918, the federation movement, though originating from a different motive from that of the movement for central councils of social agencies, united with it to the extent of the executives in the various federations and central councils organizing the American Association for Community Organization "to encourage and stimulate collective community plan-

ning and the development of better standards in the work of community organization."

A movement which began for the purpose of bringing order out of chaos in the charity of a previous generation could not long remain apathetic to a movement such as that just discussed, even though unlike the movement for central councils of social agencies it had had little or no share in its origin which in most places received its impetus from business men. Interest was awakened as one charity organization society after another in the various federated cities were drawn into the plan. As financial federations began to talk less of saving the business man from the annoyance of many solicitations and more of social planning and standards of workmanship, the fears of many charity organization workers grew less.[1] Although there was varying and independent action taken by the family social work societies of the country toward the federation movement, the charity organization movement through its national organization has never been enthusiastic over financial federation. Its attitude has been rather that of critical "watchful waiting," apparently believing that if financial federation is to come it should be only after the local social agencies have first learned to work together and to develop standards through a central council or functional federation.[2]

[1] These fears seem to center around (1) the effect of federation on standards of workmanship. Are low standard organizations by the mere fact of membership in the federation given a standing of respectability and a prolonged lease of life? (2) the effect of federation upon new forms of social effort in a community. Does an ultra-conservatism lead the federation to refuse to admit the proposed new organizations? (3) the effect of organized business interests, e. g., Chambers of Commerce where they name a certain number of the federation directors. Does the business man dictate standards or is he educated by the professional worker? (4) the effect on the contributor's interest in and knowledge of the city's social work. Are contributors better informed and more interested in social work through only one gift a year to charitable work?

[2] See Financial Federations Report prepared by W. Frank Persons, William H. Baldwin, Fred R. Johnson, and Eugene T. Lies, American Association for Organizing Charity (1917).

The War and the Charity Organization Movement

To one unfamiliar with the recent course of events in the charity organization movement the connection between it and the war must seem slight indeed, beyond possibly increasing the difficulty of raising funds for the day's work due to the vast sums needed for so-called war work. Such, however, is far from the facts of the case. The American Red Cross, in order to meet the unprecedented situation in this country created by the war, underwent vast changes of organization and personnel. The country was divided into thirteen districts. Connected with the thirteen division offices were no less than five hundred regular workers charged with the responsibility for organization and supervision. In addition there were approximately one hundred workers at the headquarters in Washington. Only sixty chapters out of the 3,618, representing nearly every county of the United States, had no Home Service section. Including sub-divisions, Home Service soon counted some 15,000 local branches.

Because the problems of civilian relief has more points in common than of difference, with the problems with which family case workers throughout the country had long been familiar and because the methods of helping to solve many of these family problems differed in few essential details from the methods followed in the past by the best case-working agencies, scores of charity organization workers in all sections of the country, both leaders and of the rank and file were "drafted" for some of the most responsible positions in the Red Cross service. This placed a heavy burden on the remaining charity organization workers, many of whom were overworked before this wholesale depletion of their ranks took place. It, however, afforded those who went a rare educational opportunity to spread the gospel of high standards in social case work. As the majority of Home Service sections were in communities where social work was not pre-

viously organized, often Home Service being the only existing form of social work, it meant the breaking of much new ground, but sowing it with tested seed.[1] A local representative of the Red Cross, mindful of the seventeen members of the staff of the local charity organization society who had been drafted into Home Service, and of the hundred odd members of Red Cross institutes who had received their field training in C. O. S. offices, expressed informally the situation in the following picturesque words: "Home Service couldn't have gone fifteen yards if it hadn't been for the charity organization preparedness all over the country."

If Home Service owes much, including its name,[2] to the charity organization movement, family social workers are beginning to appreciate an enrichment of the technique of social case work from the experiences growing out of the war.[3] The Red Cross spirit of real democracy in social service is a priceless heritage. The lessons it has taught in what can be done for the industrial cripple alone is a gain in this field of treatment that is of great and permanent value.

Shortly after the United States' entry into the war, the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity passed the following resolution covering the relationship of its constituent members to the chapters of the Red Cross operating in their respective communities:

"That we believe that the joint collection of money for war relief and ordinary agencies is essentially unsound and unwise, since it will fail to impress on the community

[1] This does not mean that adaptations of the processes of family case workers to meet a unique occasion were not necessary. However these adaptations were evolutionary in nature. See Mary Willcox Glenn, "The Spirit and Deed of Home Service," *The Survey*, Vol. XL, pp. 184-186 (1918).

[2] In an article by Frederic Almy, on "Shall We Scrap Home Service?," the author refers to the name of "home service" as another of Miss Richmond's great contributions to social work. *The Survey*, Vol. XLII, p. 893 (1919).

[3] Edward T. Devine, "The Future of Home Service," *The Survey*, Vol. XLII, pp. 861-865 (1919).

the need of maintaining all ordinary forms of social service and will leave the social agencies after the war without any financial clientele of their own, while, on the other hand, it is unfair for the social agencies to utilize the war sentiment as an easy way of obtaining support for their work;

"That the societies should place themselves at the service of civilian relief committees in any practical ways which do not cripple their own necessary day to day work; that they should not, however, serve as agents for these committees, but should insist that such work be done under the banner of the Red Cross;

"That the societies should keep in mind that the Red Cross directors have impressed upon their chapters the fact that Red Cross responsibility is not confined to the provision of material relief, but should include the highest type of family planning and personal helpfulness to the families of our soldiers and sailors."

By 1919 the great bulk of Home Service work as originally contemplated was accomplished and the Red Cross entered upon its peace-time program. Fortunately, the Red Cross consented to extend for a time its Home Service to families of others than soldiers and sailors, but in no instance are local chapters permitted to extend Home Service to civilian families if other agencies are already prepared to render similar service. The American Association for Organizing Family Social Work as the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity was rechristened, voted to increase its budget and its staff greatly in order to meet this opportunity of reaping where it had not sown. In some quarters there was expressed the desire that Home Service should permanently replace in whole or in part the movement whose history is here recorded.[1] Theoretically, it makes little difference under which banner the methods of family social work survive. Practically, it would seem, that there is room for good

[1] See Frederic Almy, "Shall We Scrap Home Service?" *The Survey*, Vol. XLII, p. 893 (1919).

case work all along the line and that the charity organization movement, called by that or any other name or names, is needed now, as much as ever before in its history.

A Retrospect

The last decade and a half have been characterized by a general interest in social questions that is without parallel in America. Although many movements whose common watchword is prevention began earlier, it has been during the past fifteen years that the movements for better housing, the prevention of tuberculosis and the abolition of child labor have reached their full strength and national proportions. In addition, these fifteen years have witnessed the awakening of a new conscience in reference to the ancient evil of venereal disease, the development of bureaus of municipal research, the rise of mental tests, the establishment of the Federal Children's Bureau, the launching of a national campaign against infant mortality, the spread of workmen's compensation and minimum wage legislation and the beginnings of legislation for health insurance, the development of Social Service Commissions in a number of religious denominations, a wider use of the school plant for social purposes, and the spread of community centers and community organization. Truly this has become the age of the social question. Moreover, the multitudes of social workers engaged in furthering these various programs have made mutual discovery of one another's existence and have become aware of one another's common aims and aspirations, all of which has definitely influenced the development of the movement, the especial concern of this study.

The outstanding feature in the history of charity organization during the past decade and a half has been a renewed interest in the technique of social case work which for the first time has been made articulate. The period of history just preceding had seen much inter-

est and energy on the part of a number of societies go into campaigns of prevention. Valuable as they were in themselves and as a means of catching the public interest, they nevertheless made it difficult, for the time, to emphasize the need of improving the technique of case work, though there were not lacking those in the movement who had a wholesome sense of humility as to the quality of their day's work and readiness for self-examination and criticism. The era of smug self-satisfaction, if such ever existed, had passed, and a vision of the possibilities of social case work has replaced it. These possibilities are now seen to apply to many fields beside poverty. The methods first worked out for those below the poverty line are to-day applied with modifications to all who for one reason or another are unadjusted or maladjusted.

With the professional attitude toward one's work, which accompanies all efforts at improving technique and the maintenance of standards, there grew up among the older and better established societies, as has been seen, a missionary spirit that led to the organization of the National Association of Societies for Organizing Charity and that aided its work until the increase in the number of societies, under one name or another, doing family social work to-day in large and small communities throughout the length and breadth of the land is without precedent. This nationalization of the movement is the second most striking characteristic of the period just surveyed.

The third outstanding feature has been an increasing specialization on the part of charity organization societies. In countless communities a drawing together of local social agencies has been taking place for the purpose of community planning. This tendency has usually taken the form of a Central Council of Social Agencies or of a Welfare Federation. The differentiation of the field of social work steadily going on for the past two decades has made necessary these central

bodies for group thinking and community planning. This development has in turn made it possible for charity organization societies to concentrate on the immediate task of doing the best piece of social case work possible for each individual claiming their services and in making case work count in the solution of community problems. It has not meant a loss of that interest in prevention which characterized the period preceding, but a larger conception of team work and a willingness to do well the more humble but equally necessary task of individual adjustment. As a matter of fact, the period has been one marked by a clearing of social vision which has meant a continuing and deepening interest in movements whose purpose is to improve social conditions. Active participation, however, has been limited mainly to the reinterpretation of case work in so far as it reveals the social causes of poverty.[1]

The enlarging of social vision has brought a new view of social relations which has resulted in a change in public attitude toward so-called "charity work." Lady Bountiful is less frequently seen and still less frequently extolled. Charity organization societies, fearing the implications of their name, have been recently adopting a variety of titles, all alike in discarding the word "charity." An examination of these shows a definite shift toward titles such as "Society for Family Social Work," which call attention to the end to be accomplished rather than to the charitable motive formerly stressed. This change from the subjective to the objective is significant and leads to the gateway of that great inclusive field of social reconstruction that now lies stretching ahead indefinitely on the road of social progress. In the words of Jane

[1] An illustration of this is a report made to the Industrial Accident Board of Massachusetts in 1913 by the Boston Provident Association, containing information based on the study of its own cases as to dependency arising out of injury to workmen. Other family agencies as the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity have rendered like service in aiding in the passage of Workmen's Compensation laws.

Addams, "the negative policy of relieving destitution or even the more generous one of preventing it, is giving way to the positive idea of raising life to its highest value." [1]

[1] Jane Addams, "Charity and Social Justice," Presidential address at the National Conference of Charities and Correction, 37th session, pp. 2-3 (1910).

CHAPTER XI

TESTS OF EFFICIENCY

It is still a new view that efficiency is as essential in the relief and prevention of distress as in any other equally important undertaking, and that efforts in the field of philanthropy, as in any other field, are to be judged in the last analysis by results. In spite of the obvious difficulties, if not impossibility, of testing the efficiency of an organization, much of whose work does not lend itself to statistical analysis, there are certain tests which, though limited in application, nevertheless do have considerable value as gauges of the efficiency of the work in question.

The tests of efficiency here proposed fall naturally into several groups. There are first those which relate to the ultimate results accomplished, judged in the light of generally accepted objects. The second set of tests relate to personnel and includes therein directors, employees, and volunteer workers. The third group of tests is concerned with problems of organization and administration.

The ultimate tests of the work of a charity organization society are listed first, as it is frequently only in the light of the objects to be attained that one can judge intelligently of the efficiency of either the personnel or the administration of the organization devised to attain those objects.

Methods whose ends are profits and methods whose ends are human welfare, require different tests of efficiency. In the last analysis, the test of the efficiency of a charity organization society is the extent to which it succeeds, if not in abolishing poverty, at least in reduc-

ing to the barest possible minimum the number of those dependent upon the charity of strangers. In short, our first test is, what percentage of this group is restored to economic independence.[1] The test of good work in charity is that people are more independent. The real test even then will not come until the children of the families aided have grown up and have families of their own. This may sound to many as an exacting test, yet how can the adequacy of much of our social case treatment be otherwise measured? If our treatment restores the widow's family to independence at the expense of all schooling for every child in the family beyond his or her fourteenth birthday, have we truly broken the vicious circle of poverty and measured up to the test of reducing to the lowest possible figure the number of dependent families in the community?

Although economic independence may seem to many a sufficient test of efficiency, the acid test of real charity goes beyond and must result in another man's ennoblement. The test of the genuinely spiritual quality of any charitable act, says St. Thomas Aquinas, is that of inspiring in the beneficiary *a desire to pray for the giver.* Rightly interpreted, this test has not lost its value even for to-day.[2] Though incapable of statistical tabulation, charity must be judged by the response that it calls forth. To borrow a phrase from the market place, a satisfied customer is the best kind of advertisement. It is also a test of efficient service. In short, what percentage of persons coming to a charity organization society for help have come because the service rendered to some other

[1] Frederic Almy attributes "the great reduction in the number of dependent families" in Buffalo "to patient constructive work." See "Twenty-fifth Anniversary at Buffalo," *Charities,* Vol. X, p. 34 (1903): "There is nothing of which we are so proud as that, in part through our work, there were fewer dependent families in Buffalo in 1907 than there were thirty years before in 1877, when the city was only one-third as large." Frederic Almy, "Relief": a Primer, reprinted by The Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, p. 26 (1910).

[2] See editorial, "A Mediæval Efficiency Test," by Edward T. Devine, *The Survey,* Vol. XXXII, pp. 596-597 (1914).

client has been such as to induce them to turn to the same agency for similar advice and similar help? How often is the woodyard test abused? How often is it unsatisfactory as a work test or as relief? How often does it either induce a "desire to pray for the giver" or produce "a satisfied customer"?

Since good case work is the first task of every charity organization society, it is essential to test the quality of its work with individuals and families. In some cities many of the social agencies do good case work; in other communities none of the agencies have more than a vague idea of the meaning of the term. What then are some specific tests applicable to family social work? To have practical value these tests must be based on the fact that good case work involves a series of steps each of which may be taken efficiently or not.

Of course, the first test of efficiency of a charity organization work is the promptness with which all emergency calls are answered. To allow more than twenty-four hours to elapse before supplying all immediate needs, marks inefficiency. Pressure of work or distance from the place of need may explain but not excuse the delay. The degree of efficiency here involved is in direct proportion to promptness of the initial action.

It is almost axiomatic to state that privacy is necessary in the first interview for the growth of that confidence and coöperation on the part of the client of a social agency which is a prerequisite of efficient case work. A crude test of efficiency in this regard is the percentage of first interviews that occur in the home of the client. Although this may not in all instances afford complete privacy, there is always the added compensation of having the first interview in surroundings which, because natural, create a most invaluable background and psychological atmosphere for the beginning of a correct diagnosis. If the client comes to the office does the worker avoid pro-

longing an interview there which it is possible to carry on in the home? If an office interview is unavoidable, is privacy provided for? The writer was frequently impressed in his visits to various charity organization society offices with the impossibility of quiet and privacy for those interviews which for one reason or other occurred there. Although the relationship between the helper and the helped is closely analogous to that of the physician and his patient, few places visited suggested the atmosphere of a physician's inner office. Doubtless lack of funds, especially for administrative expenses, in part explained this condition, but in so far as it obtained, there existed a visible index of efficiency, affording a test easy of application. Whether the interview is in the client's home or at the office, is it ever allowed to come to a close without one thing at least in sight that will help the social worker to follow up logically the investigation? Moreover, are the essential facts to be learned so firmly grasped by the interviewer that they are kept constantly in mind in all contacts with the client or other sources of information? To be compelled to return to a single source of information for facts which might have been ascertained on the first visit is to be avoided.

Inefficiency is more likely to be found in the relatively few sources of information used as a basis of treatment. Here one should not be dogmatic in assuming that the more sources of information consulted, the better the case work. Over three sources may be too many in some cases. Less than thirty-three may be too few in others Experience would seem to indicate that the common error is on the side of using too few sources. A test of efficiency in this field might consist of checking off on a list of all sources of information found useful by the most progressive societies of the country those habitually used by the society in question.[1] Although all the sources listed

[1] The St. Louis Central Council of Social Agencies has adopted as a temporary standard for societies engaged in "relief and service" a list

are not necessarily to be used in each instance, as many should be consulted as are required to formulate a plan for permanent betterment. A wide margin of choice should, of course, be allowed for any individual case. There are instances, however, where failure to consult a second available source of information can only result in poor case work. This is frequently true of cases in which unemployment is a factor. Personal prejudices and dislikes play a big part in the judgments of most people. Such a dislike amounting to a grudge against one of his men has caused more than one boss to give a very unfair picture of the character of a man under him. Accordingly, it is almost axiomatic to state that no investigation of the work record of any breadwinner of the family can be satisfactory unless it includes the judgment of at least two of his or her previous employers, especially if the judgment of the last employer is unfavorable. A simple test of efficiency here is the percentage of cases where unemployment is a factor, in which at least two employers have been interviewed.

In every investigation, it should ever be borne in mind that it is essential to ascertain for the rehabilitation of any family its standard of living when the family was at its best before starting on its course downward toward dependency. This knowledge affords a starting point for thoroughgoing family case work. Although not necessarily a goal, it reveals the warp and woof of the family structure on which to begin rebuilding. This truth is so axiomatic that it suggests a test almost universal in its applicability, namely, in what percentage of cases is there an attempt to gain this information of the family's earlier environment either by a visit to the neighborhood in question, or by correspondence?

Coöperation is the *sine qua non* of all effective case treatment. Although coöperation is more of a habit of

of eleven sources of information. See Francis H. McLean, "Central Councils and Community Planning," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 218 (1917).

mind than a matter of organization, the presence or absence of means for ready coöperation is of great importance. It is taken for granted that a charity organization society which is entitled to the name either maintains a social service exchange or uses one maintained independently or jointly with other agencies. At least if such is missing it must be assumed that a society doing good case work makes every effort possible to ascertain what other agencies are or have been interested in a given case before beginning treatment. Unless the use of the social service exchange is general in a community, the work of the local charity organization society is greatly handicapped. It is therefore in order to ask what proportion of the social agencies of the community regularly register their cases with the exchange. Is the number increasing? The percentage of agencies making use of such an exchange is an indication of the efficiency of all of them, but particularly of a family agency, whose work touches so many other agencies in every community. Continued failure on the part of a charity organization society to interest the majority of social agencies in the use of the social service exchange, would seem to indicate that somehow the charity organization society in question had failed to gain the coöperation of its community in a matter of vital concern to all. The sheer force of the reasonableness and value of such a common clearing house favors the presumption that inefficiency on the part of those conducting the exchange is in some measure responsible for any continued indifference on the part of social agencies toward its use.

Other tests of efficiency in gaining coöperation suggest themselves. With what percentage of the social agencies of the community does the local charity organization society actively and regularly coöperate in handling its own cases?[1] Is the coöperation of the nominal kind which

[1] Under "Procuring the Services of Other Helpful Agencies," the St. Louis Central Council of Social Agencies lists sixteen kinds of agencies as a standard for societies engaged in "relief and service." Francis H.

ends in an occasional exchange of compliments, or is it real coöperation six days in the week in which plans are worked out together by executives who are personally and intimately acquainted with each other's work and problems? To what extent does the society win the coöperation of such natural resources as relatives, friends, former employers, and fellow church members? In securing such coöperation are personal calls made upon those whose interest is sought? Are letters sent to the same when calls are impracticable? Are group conferences arranged with relatives and others whose interest is essential to any adequate plan of treatment?

Successful case work often demands not only wholehearted coöperation with local social agencies, but with those of other communities, especially sister charity organization societies. Out-of-town inquiries constitute an important part of the work of any efficient charity organization society. It is important, therefore, to know with what dispatch out-of-town inquiries are handled. Again the problem of the homeless makes a demand on a type of coöperation that is nation-wide. The recognition of this truth led progressive charity organization societies to draft a transportation agreement, by the terms of which each signer covenants not to "pass on" the homeless but to attempt some plan of constructive treatment for each. It is a test of elementary efficiency to learn whether a given society has signed the above-mentioned agreement and lives up to its spirit as well as its letter.

Two tests of practical importance bearing on treatment are in order. First, the length of time that elapses on an average between the completing of the investigation and the mapping out of a definite plan of treatment, and second, the number of times on an average that the plan of treatment has to be changed before the right treatment is worked out for the particular case in question.

McLean, "Central Councils and Community Planning," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 218 (1917).

Some latitude must of course be allowed in applying both of these tests, for, to quote Miss Richmond and Mr. Hall, "in social as in medical case work, 'every treatment is an experiment,' and those who attempt to fasten their ready-made schemes upon anything so delicate as family life are guilty, however innocently, of a sort of quackery."[1]

It need not be reiterated here that material relief is but a part and often a small part of treatment. If it seems to assume an undue amount of space in the tests of efficiency here given, it is solely because it is more capable of measurement and hence of statistical statement.

Although material relief is always a dangerous instrument of treatment, and so should not be used except when absolutely necessary, it should always be used unsparingly when used or, in more technical language, should be "adequate." It need hardly be pointed out that there are marked individual differences in the ability of housewives of all income groups to make a dollar go a certain distance and that the purchasing power of a dollar varies from community to community and, more important, that standards of living are different in country, town and city. Nevertheless, there is a limit as to what a dollar will buy, no matter in whose hands or where spent. Moreover, differences in purchasing power or standards of living are not so great that the amount of relief per family in one city should require but half the relief granted in another city. A test of efficiency of decided value is, therefore, to be found in ascertaining how far short of "adequate" for the community in question does the material relief granted by any society fall. Has the society translated into dollars and cents the cost of maintaining a standard of living below which it allows none of its families to fall? Does it use this standard

[1] Mary E. Richmond and Fred S. Hall, "A Study of Nine Hundred and Eighty-Five Widows," Publication C. O. 34, Russell Sage Foundation, p. 19 (1913).

not as a minimum but with discrimination as a guide? Does it reëstimate at reasonable intervals the cost of maintaining this standard in view of the constant fluctuation in prices?

It is so generally accepted as to be beyond question that no institution, no matter how well administered, offers as good a preparation for life as a good home, no matter how humble. This being so, it follows that any society which allows children of widows to be committed to child-caring institutions because of "poverty only" invites serious criticism as to the efficiency of its work. Such a course is a denial of the primary function of a charity organization society, namely, family rehabilitation. In the study by Miss Richmond and Mr. Hall previously quoted, it is stated "that only eighty children out of a possible 3,136, or a possible 2,500, were put into institutions for longer or shorter periods, or left there, on account of poverty, with the approval or tacit consent of the societies concerned. This is either 2½ or 3%, according as the first or second total is used as a basis of calculation."[1] Such an analysis affords a most valuable test of the efficiency of work whose prime object is the restoration of normal family life.

The efficiency of any organization can be no greater than the efficiency of its workers. An elementary though indirect test of the efficiency of charity organization societies is therefore to be found in the amount of training to be found in its personnel. It would take us too far afield to define with great accuracy all that is to be included under the term, a trained worker. Suffice it to say that on three counts the trained worker, whether paid or volunteer, differs from the untrained. First, the trained worker has the command of a specialized body of knowledge that has been organized or systematized for daily use. Second, the trained worker in contrast to the

[1] Mary E. Richmond and Fred S. Hall, "A Study of Nine Hundred and Eighty-Five Widows," Publication C. O. 34, Russell Sage Foundation, p. 37 (1913).

untrained, has developed a consistent point of view—a philosophy, if you will—that underlies all his work. Third, the trained worker has developed a special skill or technique for his work. In all his activities the trained worker will be the one ever most open to criticism and self-examination. Do I get personal satisfaction from my work, and am I growing because of it? Do I know the kind of a world I am trying to make and does my work help to make this world a reality? are questions ever present in the mind of the trained worker. An organization in which the trained worker as here pictured is conspicuously absent cannot expect to know what standards of efficiency are, much less to apply them.

Even the best of workers finds his or her standards lowered under pressure of too much work.[1] It is therefore important to know how many cases per year one trained worker is expected to treat on an average. A standard set by one society limits the number to 125 per year. It is obvious that such a test must be applied with much latitude. No two types of cases, not to mention no two cases of the same type, require the same amount of thought and time.[2] Nevertheless, there is value in knowing whether the workers are treating 80 or 160 families a month. It may be taken for granted that when the latter obtains over a given period of time, the quality of work is lower than when the number is 80. Thus far we have not distinguished between paid and volunteer work. If it is trained service, as it should be, there is no reason to. There is one aspect of volunteer service which merits special mention, namely, friendly visiting. This is a special part of treatment in many if not all cases. It therefore follows that the quality of the case work of a charity organization society is directly

[1] It is almost the universal experience that during the first months of an industrial depression the case work of charity organization societies suffers because of pressure of work.

[2] To make the test more accurate, cases might be graded e. g., Widows, Homeless Men, Motherless Families, etc., or Acute and Temporary, Intermittent, Chronic.

influenced by the number of such visitors in its service.[1] Probably in no other detail of equipment for work do societies differ as much as in the number of friendly visitors at their command.

A distinguishing feature of much of the case work of charity organization societies is that the plans of treatment carried out are the joint product of many minds meeting in conference. The efficiency with which these so-called "case conferences" are conducted affects in turn the efficiency of much of the family planning that is done. One of the values of the meeting of many minds on a problem is the greater wealth of experience that is thereby made available. The need for such group thinking is obvious to any one who has been called upon to help solve any family problem. A logical test of efficiency therefore is found in an analysis of the personnel of a given conference. Does it represent all points of view, that of the housewife and mother, the professional man and woman, the person of little means as well as those comfortably situated? Does the personnel include representatives of other social agencies working in the same community or district? Is there a fair degree of regularity in attendance of the members of the conference, making for esprit de corps? Are unready cases brought to the conference for discussion or are they not only carefully prepared but also carefully chosen because of their educational value to the conference, as well as because of the fact that they present problems on which the district secretary needs the collective advice of the conference? Is there a constant effort on the part of the chairman of the conference to draw each member into discussion and at the same time keep the line of discussion moving steadily toward the goal of a definite conclusion? Is everything done to help the members of the conference to grow in

[1] It is of course necessary to take into account the amount of time per week that each visitor gives to the work.

wisdom? Are cases passed on at one meeting ever reviewed at subsequent meetings? Sometimes real planning falls to the ground between the conference committee and the district agent. Do conference members know when their plans work well or when they fail and why? From the former would come encouragement; from the latter, the opportunity to gain further insight into the principles of all sound case work. Finally, does the chairman always endeavor to present the case in its larger aspects in so far as every case probably presents a social problem, such as the need for more adequate housing laws, the better enforcement of the law against truancy or the need for more adequate facilities for wholesome recreation?

The last test to claim our attention relative to the technique of social case work is the percentage of cases which a society finds it necessary "to reopen."[1] The theory which underlies such a test is that thoroughgoing case work to-day aims at putting a family permanently on its feet. If the plan for this is a poor one, including inadequate relief, or if good but poorly executed, the case is more than likely to relapse, or if similar treatment continues, to become recurrent. The new point of view in treatment plans with its eye on the future, ten, fifteen or twenty years ahead. It takes in all members of the family and concerns itself with the future of the children involved lest poverty should become a vicious circle, continuing indefinitely. It is not to be assumed that every case should be closed when an independent income level is reached. The importance, therefore, of having a case record carefully reviewed by a disinterested and judicial mind before closing is self-evident. To prevent the too hasty closing of cases after the immediate situation which brought the family in question under the society's care has changed, certain societies require the considera-

[1] This test may be modified so as to include only cases reopened within a year, or other specified time.

tion by some central authority such as the registrar's office, or a committee on closed cases, of all cases which the district office is about to close. In applying the foregoing test, it must be remembered that some societies assume that the family once under care should be followed up indefinitely by the friendly visitor or by active treatment.

A test akin to that just suggested is what percentage of cases under the society's care are inactive. It is generally agreed that the existence of a large number of such cases which indicate a failure to reach a conclusion regarding the treatment involved as finished or unfinished, indicates a certain degree of inefficiency. To guard against this danger, at least one society requires a review by the visitors every month of all the inactive records in the districts.

Charity organization societies that live up to their possibilities have other objects than those just stated. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that these other "objects" are inseparable from any thoroughgoing efforts looking toward the reduction of dependency. These objects are first, the education of the public in the correct methods of social case treatment, and second, the scientific analysis of the causes of poverty that society with knowledge founded on facts may take such steps to improve social and economic conditions that much future poverty may be prevented. Both of these objects offers its own tests of efficiency.

Few who understand the task confronting charity organization societies will minimize the importance of the educational part of its program. The opportunities in every community for really thoroughgoing case work are such as would swamp any charity organization society, however well organized. Moreover, such organizations would not consider it desirable to monopolize all the charitable work in their respective communities, granted such were possible. They aim rather, as already pointed

out,[1] to improve the quality of the beneficence which is practiced by the typical citizen in his everyday relationships, and to see that our children's children help adjust the unadjusted of their day better than we are to-day. The nature of the job and its size preclude any other course. It therefore follows that a legitimate test of the efficiency of a charity organization society is the general level of intelligence of the public at large in matters of philanthropy.

If charity organization societies were only able to tell what they know and do in a way to command attention, they would meet with a minimum of criticism and indifference. A test of the extent to which any society has lived up to its opportunities to educate public opinion comes at a time of a local disaster or during a period of universal unemployment. Does the community at large at such times have sufficient understanding and confidence in the work of the society to seek its aid in the solution of problems coming within its special field? If not, have one or more of the following channels been used to create such understanding and confidence, public meetings, well advertised and with attractive programs; an intelligent and regular use of the press; exhibits; the publication of reports, pamphlets and bulletins that compel attention, a wise use of volunteers adequately supervised; study classes; personal missionary work in the community?

Various societies have utilized each of these methods with gratifying results. Space permits but a few illustrations. Mr. Oscar McCulloch, founder of the Indianapolis Society, is said to have attributed whatever success it had in its early days to the public meetings held on the Sunday evenings following Thanksgiving days; "meetings which were held in the large opera house, from which many were turned away, at which short talks was given on phases of charity, not statistical

[1] See pp. 96, 97.

but inspirational; whose proceedings were reported by the daily papers, column after column and were circulated afterwards in pamphlet form."[1] Another society evolved a method of systematic advertising by offering to any church a program of three ten-minute speeches on three topics covering the lines of most importance in the work of the society. No money was asked for. The churches welcomed the program and the volunteer speakers found no lack of opportunities for speaking.[2] The charity organization society of another city, desiring the understanding and support of the union workingmen of the city, has tried the plan of a joint meeting with the local Trades and Labor Council.[3]

A ready test of the efficiency of a society's efforts to educate the public is the attitude of the local press not only toward the society but in any matter involving principles of relief. To what percentage of newspapers has there been a conscious and definite attempt on the part of the society in question to afford a real understanding of its aims and methods? Mention has already been made of one general secretary who went out of his way to explain the work of his organization to each "cub" reporter sent to get news, on the theory that some day he might be promoted to city editor. The policy has already borne fruit in the intelligent support of the press of that city.[4] Besides this more or less passive attitude toward the press, what active use is made of its columns as mediums of popular education? Has any agreement been made with leading newspapers for a certain amount of space each week to be supplied by the local charity organization society? Such has been tried in at least one

[1] Jeffrey Brackett, Supervision and Education in Philanthropy, p. 134 (1903).

[2] Anon., "In the Field of Organizing Charity," *Charities and The Commons,* Vol. XV, p. 405 (1905). See also Anon., "Informing the Public on Private Charities," *The Survey,* Vol. XXX, p. 726 (1913).

[3] Anon., *Charities,* Vol. VIII, p. 147 (1902).

[4] See pp. 348-350.

large city.[1] When charity organization societies are able to tell what they know of social conditions and their results in the lives of the disadvantaged, they will command the space in the daily press which they deserve.

What has just been said of commanding attention in the press applies equally to annual reports, bulletins and other literature issued. Are they presented in readable form? Do the annual reports educate their readers in the correct methods of philanthropy and in an understanding of the social forces making for poverty, or do they appeal almost solely to their spirit of benevolence and leave them otherwise unenlightened? How many charity organization societies test their money-getting methods by the amount of intelligent understanding of the causes of poverty they produce? Do annual reports render to the public an honest and clear statement of stewardship or are they actively miseducating the public in regard to the methods of constructive case work? In short, is the charity of the community becoming increasingly the privilege of the thoughtful only?

One of the most effective means of educating the public is the intelligent use of volunteers. The spoken word of one with first-hand knowledge carries conviction where printed words fail. Anything which increases the number of volunteers without lowering the standard of service affords just so many more channels for vital contact between the society and the public at large. Tests of efficiency in the use of volunteers are discussed elsewhere.[2]

What has just been said of the effectiveness of a first-hand knowledge of aims and methods applies with equal force to any missionary efforts on an individual basis put forth by the society itself. Has it ever conducted

[1] Anon., "In the Field of Organizing Charity," *Charities and The Commons*, Vol. XV, p. 405 (1905). See also Anon., "Informing the Public on Private Charities," *The Survey*, Vol. XXX, p. 756 (1913).

[2] See p. 465.

an educational canvass whose object has been to visit at least the influential families in its community to present to them personally the purpose and work that it was doing? If any money is raised by a collector, is the opportunity always grasped of using some one who not only asks for contributions but explains as well the principles and methods of its work? [1]

Charity Organization Societies and Movements for Improving Social Conditions

The vital relationship between social case work and community movements has been pointed out elsewhere.[2] To know whether a charity organization society is making case work function in community work is about as essential as to know whether it is doing good case work. What tests can one apply to arrive at an intelligent answer? To what extent does the society analyze the facts with which it deals in its daily contact with families and individuals? To what extent are these facts tabulated and promptly brought to the attention of the public or to an agency interested in preventive work in the field of the problem presented? It is self-evident that the case records of the society must be accurately kept and tabulated in such a manner as to be capable of statistical treatment if the society is to have the basis on which to render such service.

It is possible that the contributions of some societies must necessarily be limited in this field, due to the small number of cases under treatment. But these societies are few. Even with the smaller societies, the number of cases on record rapidly accumulates, and if they have been accurately and uniformly kept they afford valuable data for statistical study.

With the advent of the Russell Sage Foundation largely,

[1] See pp. 96, 146.

[2] Jeffrey R. Brackett, "Education and Supervision in Charity," p. 144 (1903).

a child of the charity organization movement,[1] which constitutes a huge laboratory for the compilation and interpretation of social facts, it may be contended that the necessity for individual societies to collect and interpret their own facts is to a certain degree lessened. Such may be true in part, but it makes it all the more imperative that societies which take this position should adopt the uniform record schedule approved by the Russell Sage Foundation and should always hold themselves ready to coöperate in any study of their records which the above-named Foundation may undertake, especially those made by its charity organization department.

In addition to furnishing the public or other social agencies with a fact basis for preventive movements, charity organization societies should take an active interest in pushing the matter further. If no agency exists to meet the problem it should aid in its creation or undertake it itself. If a law is needed, it should agitate until such is secured. It is only by the systematic coöperation of the social agencies and the socially minded in each community that such results can be accomplished. Has the charity organization society helped to create the machinery for such systematic coöperation? Besides assuring a social service exchange, no charity organization society can be said to have measured up to its highest efficiency which has not been active in creating or aiding in the creation of some organization in the form of a city conference or a central council of social agencies, whose object is to coördinate the social forces of the community. In short, a vital test of the efficiency of any case work agency is not alone the number of families helped but the number of useful laws it has helped to place on the statute books and the number of social move-

[1] It is a matter of common knowledge that it was Mr. Robert de Forest, president of the New York Society who suggested to Mrs. Russell Sage the need for such work as that conducted by the foregoing Foundation. He afterward played an important rôle in putting the plan into operation.

ments of a preventive character it has helped to foster directly or indirectly.

The Personnel

Probably the most important factor in the efficiency of any organization is the calibre of person it commands in its services. The truth of this statement is most clearly seen in those organizations where the personal equation looms largest, as is the case with all work dealing with individuals. It is here that neither hours nor quantity of product nor skill is the first thing, but rather what, for want of a better term, we may call the spirit of the worker. For this, science has not revealed any definite measure of individual capacity. Nevertheless, there are certain rough tests which are serviceable in ascertaining the relative fitness of a given group of workers for the task in hand.

Since much of the work of social case workers involves human contacts, the personality of the worker is of utmost importance. "If culture means anything," writes Miss Richmond, "it means the conquest of our natural instincts, and the substitution for them of a sympathetic and patient appreciation of the lives and aims of creatures least like ourselves." A list of qualifications which carries the weight of authority and stresses both personality and training follows:

Health, that we may be cheerful.

Hopefulness, that we may infuse new life into those with whom we come into contact.

Power of discrimination, as no two persons are alike, no two persons can be met or dealt with the same way.

Power of endurance.

Cheerful disposition.

Good reasoning powers.

Thoughtfulness, firmness, kindness, keen observation, judgment of human nature, sympathy and tact.

Power to think and act quickly.

Ability to keep one's equilibrium in a trying moment.

Adaptibility, perseverance, diplomacy, thoroughness, good memory for faces and names.

A knowledge of the city, an acquaintance with its conditions and resources; knowledge of trade unions and their customs.

A knowledge of the average wages in the different lines.

A general and practical knowledge of every day life.

Strong persuasive powers.

Trained legal instinct.[1]

A good social case worker must have the ability to command such confidence as to succeed in gaining coöperation. If there is constant complaint that this or that individual receiving treatment or this or that agency will not coöperate, one may rest assured that the worker in question is in the wrong pew in social work and inefficiency is bound to accompany his or her work. As personal acquaintance with workers in other organizations makes possible a degree of coöperation not otherwise obtainable, it is not out of order to ask if the worker in question grasps all opportunities for making such personal contacts as membership in a local social workers' club, attendance at local, state and national conferences of social work.

A good social case worker must have such a grasp of the essential facts to be ascertained in all interviews with clients that, without any visible memorandum in the form of notebook, he or she may secure those facts as completely as though the customary face card of the case record had been in evidence at all times. The efficiency of the worker may well be said to vary in direct ratio to the amount of dependence placed on a prearranged schedule, paper and pencil. In brief, the good worker must possess in addition to the charm and force of personality that

[1] Francis H. McLean, "Organized Charity," *Charities and The Commons,* Vol. XXI, p. 317 (1908).

gains coöperation, an orderly mind, a discriminating judgment of values and a retentive memory.

Besides the tests of the fitness of personality for the work in hand, there are the tests of intellectual endowment and special equipment for the job already touched upon. What educational standards, either general or special, does the charity organization society in question demand of its would-be employees? Does it require a high school course or its equivalent, a year's training in a recognized school of social work? Does the society require further study and training of its workers during a period of probation? All other factors the same, the quality of the work of that society with the highest requirements of preparation on the part of its staff will be the best.

While the test as to salaries paid must necessarily frequently fail, it has merit in enough instances to have value. What is the scale of salaries paid to district workers, to district secretaries, to the general secretary? A veteran in the ranks of charity organization told the writer that throughout the movement one of the great causes of inefficiency in many societies, especially in the smaller communities, has been the failure to provide salaries sufficiently large to attract men of the first grade of ability. The analogy of the charity organization worker is with the physician rather than with the clergyman. In all fields, however, the laborer is worthy of his hire. An expert task requires expert services, which costs. The fee of a medical specialist does not subject him to the charge of being such for what is in it, nor does it prevent him from being a public-spirited citizen. Moreover, there is nothing more praiseworthy about the work of a charity organization society than there is about teaching, or preaching, or doctoring, or sanitary engineering, or any other line of honest work. Such work can make no special claims. It ought to stand

or fall of its own merit, and should be supported by the community it serves on this basis and this basis alone.[1]

Personnel of Volunteer Force

While the tests immediately preceding were written with the paid employee primarily in mind, practically all apply equally to the volunteer. As has been well pointed out, the epoch in social work which was characterized by a certain sentimentality about volunteers, is coming to a close.[2] Credit has been given to volunteers where credit was not due. To-day volunteers are being obliged to prove their capacity for engaging in social work because social workers have learned through experience with volunteers what high standards can be expected of those who wish to make social work their avocation. It is antiquated to contrast the professional with the volunteer worker. "Salary has nothing to do with the quality and quantity of an individual's contribution to social work. . . . What counts in social work as in anything else is the amount of time, thought and ability that an individual expends upon the job." [3]

Organization

If charity organization societies stand for one thing above all else, it is for that efficiency in charity that results from right organization. It is therefore in order to inquire whether the form of organization of the typical charity organization society best accomplishes its ends. It is, of course, to be borne in mind that a form of organization for a small town cannot be or should not be identical with that of a metropolitan city. In the his-

[1] Mary E. Richmond, "The Training of Charity Workers," *Charities Review*, Vol. VI, pp. 320-321 (1897).

[2] Karl de Schweinitz, Avocational Guidance. Proceedings, National Conference of Charities and Connection, 44th session, pp. 118-125 (1917).

[3] *Ibid.*

torical part of this study several forms of organization societies have been noted. Two of them have been referred to as the so-called Philadelphia and St. Paul plans, respectively. In addition to these there is the more typical form of organization that has developed elsewhere and a more recent form found in Rochester, New York. In the Philadelphia plan[1] the distinguishing feature is its decentralization, with almost complete local autonomy even to finances. In the St. Paul plan the governing body of the Associated Charities is composed of official representatives from the various social agencies of the city.[2] In the more usual form of organization obtaining elsewhere, the charity organization society is one of a group of social agencies. It has its own board of directors, its paid executive head and staff, responsible in the main directly to him though working under the district plan. The board has its various committees, such as those on finance, publicity, etc., and in certain communities on such problems as housing, and tuberculosis. Under the Rochester plan the central council of social agencies of the city constitutes the general board of the United Charities, electing the executive committee, which manages the society's work.

By what tests may one judge which form of organization best fits the purposes of a social agency whose object is thorough social case treatment, the education of the public in the principles of relief and the formation of a public opinion educated as to the social and economic factors causing poverty? It is not easy to give an answer. Many of the problems are yet to be worked out. However, time enough has passed since the charity organization movement was launched to suggest certain tests, tentative though they must be, which may throw light on the question raised.

In the first place, although retaining through the dis-

[1] This has since been changed. See p. 284.
[2] St. Paul has long since abandoned this plan.

trict plan all the advantages of local community pride in large cities, the central body of a charity organization society should have complete administrative control over the whole territory served by the society. Uniformity of service is made necessary by the interrelation of various parts of any great city and the interdependence of their welfare. The whole city suffers from poor service in any of its parts. Standardization of service can only be secured through centralized control. The first test of efficiency in matters of organization, therefore asks, is the administrative control over the work of the society in all its districts and departments so centralized that it insures uniformity of service?

Although centralization is essential for efficiency for reasons just given, there should be decentralization of work through the district plan. The district superintendent should have an extent of territory of a size that will allow him or her to know its assets and liabilities like a book. It should be small enough to utilize what is existent in every community, though often dormant,—namely, its neighborhood pride and spirit. It should be of such a size that neighborly relations with those to be helped can be readily established. Our second test as to organization raises the question, is the city districted in such a fashion as to conserve neighborhood spirit and to insure to each district office what Chalmers called "a manageable portion of territory"? [1]

The third test of efficiency in the matter of organization relates to activity in all parts of the organization. Of the various committees of the society, how many are active? It is more important that there be fewer committees, but each fundamental and active than a long list with the majority so much dead wood. New committees may always be added as occasion demands.

The fourth test raises the question of organization for economy in so far as it is not incompatible with efficiency.

[1] It is obvious that this test is applicable only to larger communities.

Are overhead charges kept at a minimum, if not by the use of a social service building, at least by having as many social agencies as possible occupy quarters in the same building, thus saving on telephone expenses,[1] clerks, often on heat and janitor service? This does not take into account the very real gain in coöperation which results from occupying offices within a few feet of each other.

A final test in the field of organization refers to relations to the local government. It is axiomatic to say that they should be of the most coöperative nature. Many grave dangers arise, however, when the coöperation assumes the form of a subsidy or other financial support. Bureaus of Municipal Research still find that they can render more efficient service when supported independently of the public purse. Many of the arguments in favor of the position of a free lance apply to an agency aiming to be a standard bearer in the field of family rehabilitation. With public opinion in its present state of enlightenment as to the standards of social case treatment, a society with independent support can, as a rule, maintain higher standards than when the reverse is true. The future may, let us hope, tell a different tale. It is difficult to see, however, how at any time a society largely supported by government through the subsidy system or maintained as a government department, can as readily make its case work function socially if such would involve criticism of a collateral department of government, such as the departments of health, housing or education.

An efficient form of organization may, however, function inefficiently. It is, therefore, necessary to suggest a set of tests which deals with functioning, just as the last set presented dealt with structure.

At the head of every charity organization society stands the board of directors. The first test of efficiency here is, therefore, the obvious one,—do the directors really

[1] A central operator in the building is the usual method.

direct? This does not mean that the office detail, the direction of subordinate paid employees, the operation of the relief department, should be controlled by the board of directors. Such would be bad administrative policy wherever found. The work of a charity organization society, however, requires the coördination of the friendly forces of the community for the benefit of the distressed and unfortunate. "No man can do it. There must be a nucleus of interested people, thoroughly convinced of the necessity and value of the movement, who are known as giving, not merely money, but still more, time and thought to the effort. The directors must not merely lend their names,—they must give intelligent interest, contagious enthusiasm and real directive force."[1] They must enlist "the hearty and persistent coöperation in voluntary and unpaid work of a wide circle of people differing in temperament, creed, habits of life and even nationality." [2]

A test of the efficiency of a board to render this important service lies in an analysis of its composition. Is the board as representative as possible? Does it command the confidence of the community?

"But the best list of names will not suffice, though every church, social and business interest is represented on it. No one man, no matter how tactful and resourceful, can be wise enough and prudent enough to avoid the misunderstanding so constantly arising, to convince the people so apt to look only from their own point of view. The representatives of the various interests associated must feel that they are coöperating; they must feel that they have a genuine share in the work, and they can only be brought to this point by the aid of the volunteer directors. Then, again, it is sometimes necessary to show the coöperating agencies certain faults or deficiencies in their methods. To do this without giving offense

[1] Alexander Johnson, "An Open Letter to Directors," *The Survey*, Vol. XXIV, p. 135 (1910).
[2] *Ibid.*

is difficult enough under any circumstances, but it is much more difficult when it has to be done by the paid secretary than when it is undertaken by a volunteer member of the board of directors.

An ordinary business pays, in money, every one who works for it. But an associated charities must have many other workers besides the paid agents. How can we enlist them and keep them in line? It cannot be done unless they feel that those who direct are themselves unselfish workers, actuated by the same motives that have brought them into the fellowship. And, when the volunteer workers lose interest and drop out, the society is at the beginning of the end of its best usefulness. The numbers and interest of the volunteer workers are among the best tests of a society's vigor." [1]

Among the duties of the board of directors, their financial responsibility must not be overlooked. While the work of propaganda is almost entirely the duty of the paid worker, the question of finance belongs in the last analysis with the board of directors. This obligation they may discharge through a finance committee, through the employment of a financial secretary or the creation of a citizen committee. There is inefficiency, if not injustice, in any society where the general secretary is expected to administer the work of his society and at the same time to raise his or her own salary and that of the staff. A clear understanding of a division of responsibility should obtain from the beginning.

Finally, do the members of the board of directors apply the same business and professional standards to the work of the society that they apply to their business enterprises or professions? Are they determined that no part of the work of the society shall in any sense be "penny wise and pound foolish"?

It follows from what has just been said of the duties of the board of directors that the paid executive head

[1] Alexander Johnson, "An Open Letter to Directors," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 135 (1910).

should be left free to engage or dismiss whom he wishes for the good of the service, provided it is consistent with the budget; that he should be responsible directly or indirectly for the direction of the work of all subordinates, including all details of administration connected with the day's work of the society. Both political science, with its emphasis on the principle of the short ballot, and business administration with its concentration of authority, teach the wisdom of the above statements. In so far as a board member of a charity organization society may either engage or dismiss an employee, inefficiency has entered into the work of the society in question. This does not mean that there should not be a partnership between the directing board and the body of the workers, nor that the principles of democracy being introduced into industrial management should not apply here.

Administration

The administration of any social agency involves both its arrangements for doing its work and its relations to the public. The former raises questions of

The keeping of useful records.
Office system.
Supervision of workers.
Training new workers.
Maintaining esprit de corps.

The latter raises questions of

Finance
Propaganda
Reports
Accessibility to those who desire to make use of it.

It remains for us to discuss standards and tests of efficiency for each.

The Keeping of Useful Records

The usefulness of the records of a charity organization society are to be measured by their value to the individual or family concerned, to the community in arousing effort for the common welfare, and lastly, to the socal agency keeping them, as a basis for reports of their stewardship of the funds entrusted to them. What then are the standards of usefulness that one can apply to records. One must remember that small societies do not require the variety of records needed in large city offices, and that the art of case recording is still in a stage that does not permit of dogmatism.

Beginning with the case record, which form of record even the smallest society keeps, what is to be the standard of its completeness? It perhaps would not be well to go below the standard found in one city where a minimum case record is required to contain information on at least twenty-one points, such as names, previous addresses, employers (departments and foremen), names and addresses of relatives, etc.[1] Of equal importance with the completeness of information sought is the matter of the form of the record. Is it such as to encourage those keeping records to record *facts* rather than impressions? [2] Is the form of schedule comparable with those of previous years, but more important still, with those of the most progressive societies of the country?

Aside from the question of the material included in the case record, there are some details of method in record keeping that make for efficiency. Are committee decisions made to stand out by entering in red or underlining? Are long entries properly organized and broken up into paragraphs? Are marginal headings ever used? Are long records indexed? When correspondence is filed

[1] St. Louis. See Francis H. McLean. "Central Councils and Community Planning," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 216-219 (1917).

[2] Of course it is true that no matter what form is used an unskilled worker is likely to record impressions rather than facts.

separately from the history sheets, does the entry concerning letters received contain a line or two summarizing their contents to facilitate a concentration of attention on the salient features of the case history?

It is self-evident that the value of facts learned through investigation is almost in direct ratio to the promptness with which they are put into permanent form in the case records, not only because when rough notes "cool," they lose much of their original value, but because they are constantly needed in each stage of treatment. The writer knows of some societies in which much of this work is put off until the summer months, when the number of families cared for by all societies is materially reduced. While the excuse for not keeping records at all times up-to-date may be pressure of other work which is more urgent, it nevertheless follows that just in proportion as time elapses before transcribing facts into permanent records is there a loss of efficiency.

Mention has been made of the contrast in the point of view of treatment which aims to relieve current distress only, and treatment that is truly constructive in planning ahead fifteen or twenty years with the welfare of the entire family, including that of the youngest child, constantly kept in mind. The latter view has resulted in the use by some societies of a statistical card which shows at a glance, the health history, work history, personal traits, home conditions, income, etc., of each member of any family under the society's care and the treatment used. Space is left under each heading to enter all steps which are taken to remedy defects or to improve the welfare of the individual in respect to any of the items listed. Truly efficient case work would not permit of closing the case until all weaknesses or defects were remedied, even though immediate restoration to independence did not depend on some of the work undertaken. A summary at the end of stated periods shows what has been done on the case during the period in question, and hence

serves as a test of efficiency. In combination with a system of signals, it is possible for each society to review its work each year, to discover the human elements with which it is dealing and to present in graphic form the social status, racial characteristics, physical, mental and moral peculiarities, the helps employed in dealing with the family, and such other facts as serve to epitomize the family condition, diagnosis and treatment. Such a card reveals what social machinery for handling certain defects and problems is lacking in a given community as, for example, farm colonies for inebriates, and dental clinics, and also makes it possible for a charity organization society to supply any agency engaged largely in preventive work, the facts it may need in its campaigns, be they legislative or educational, as to the relation between poverty and the reform in question.[1] In brief, a very important test of whether any charity organization society is living up to its full responsibilities is the promptness with which it can "translate its cases into problems." This test is of paramount importance. "The charity worker who is content with the relief of pressing needs does not tabulate statistical material; but if he has insight into needs, vision and faith that misery may one day be abolished, his vision will lead him to combine, with his effort for the needy, a recording of such research material as may be needed for legislative or other action." [2]

Office System

In the management of the office of a charity organization society there is no more excuse for not using every time-saver and method making for efficiency than

[1] The keeping of such cards involves regularity, accuracy and patience together with clerical labor.

[2] Rose J. McHugh, "The Meaning and Limitations of Records in Relief Work," a paper read at the fourth biennial meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, held in Washington, D. C., September 17-20 (1916).

there is for not using them in the office of a bank, commercial house or a manufacturing concern. This raises questions of methods used in case recording, filing and indexing and the use of mechanical devices to save labor. It seems to be the general consensus of opinion that the filing of case records and subject matter of all sorts should be in vertical files in folders arranged numerically with the complementary card index. Facility of finding data needed is not the only reason for this arrangement. No society is small enough not to need a social service exchange. Such an exchange or registry of cases by other societies is impossible without an alphabetical card index of all cases—C. O. S. cases and others combined. Whether a society uses the card index method as opposed to filing its folders and records alphabetically thus becomes a test of prime importance in office efficiency.

In the conduct of a social service exchange, quick and careful means of identification are essential to efficiency. Street indexes offer a means of identifying cases which the index fails to show up because of variations of spelling. Street indexes are also valuable in connection with campaigns to improve social and living conditions. Whether a society maintains such an index bears directly on its ability to translate cases into problems. Experience seems to teach the wisdom of filing all correspondence alphabetically rather than by subject matter. The adherence to this plan offers a further test of office efficiency. It need hardly be added that wherever feasible charity organization societies, in common with all social agencies, should make use of all aids to memory, as "the tickler," and all labor-saving devices possible, such as adding machines and systems of duplicate writing. By a single operation of the typewriter, one well-known social agency prepares the three necessary records of each contribution, namely (1) the subscribers' receipt, ready for mailing in a window envelope, (2) entry of gift on page of donation book used by both the cashier and subscription depart-

ment, (3) card record of gift—cards filed alphabetically during year, and then sent to printers for making contributors' list in annual report. At the same time an adding machine attached to the typewriter mechanically adds the amounts received each day. Each of the three records bears the same serial number. Such methods obviously spell efficiency.

One final test is in order, in reference to the office side of efficiency. Has some person experienced in office equipment and arrangement been consulted as to lighting, arrangement of furniture, especially the files, the installation of new equipment where needed, and the best utilization of floor space, so as to afford opportunity for complete privacy for any interviews which must be held either in part or in whole. If the analogy between the social worker and the physician holds good at any point, it is in the confidential nature of the relationship and the desirability of every facility being used to create a spirit of coöperation between the client and the worker. The arrangement of many offices make for neither confidence nor coöperation, because it does not respect the rights of privacy much less personality.

Supervision of Workers

Only by a systematic critical review of the work of a charity organization society is there hope of increasing the efficiency of the work and workers. The rapid changes in personnel, paid as well as volunteer, in many societies, makes this policy all the more imperative. In seeking to learn the relative efficiency of any case work agency, it is in order to ask if any supervision of work done is attempted. If so, is it adequate? Too much work is expected of any case supervisor if he or she cannot keep constantly in touch with at least some current case records and improve the quality of current treatment by frequent constructive criticisms and sug-

gestions, or if he or she finds little or no time for regular personal conferences with district superintendents or for attendance at regular intervals at district conferences. Under the possible methods of supervision, it is well to ascertain whether it is limited to reading current and closed records or whether this is supplemented by not only the personal conferences above referred to, but also by regular meetings of visitors for the technical discussion of case and district work and by the use of daily and monthly reports covering such details of the day's work as number of active cases, number of new cases, number of visits made, number of pension cases, and amount of emergency expenditures from the general fund. If a society has no machinery for regularly supervising the work of its visitors, it may at least encourage self-supervision by requiring of each visitor at definite periods synopses of a given number of cases. A study of a certain period of work six months later may have valuable results in the way of self-supervision.[1]

The ultimate object of all supervision is to increase efficiency. It may attempt to accomplish this by a prompt elimination from the services of a society of all who do not attain a certain standard or it may afford the basis of instructing and encouraging individual workers and of grading all,[2] so that there can be a conscious attempt to fit the job to the worker at each stage of his or her development. This would have a tendency toward reducing "labor turn over." This principle of scientific management is as applicable to philanthropic agencies as to the world of business. A group of workers who are constantly shifting obviously do not possess the efficiency of a like sized group which is seasoned and has acquired the habit of teamwork. A district secretary, for example,

[1] Of course self-supervision may be used in conjunction with the employment of a case work supervisor.

[2] See Gertrude Vaile, "An Experiment in Trying to Grade District Visitors," Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, 42nd session, p. 88 (1915).

who but yesterday, figuratively speaking, was in the employ of another agency, or was working in another city, cannot possess that intimate knowledge of his or her district as regards its social assets and liabilities, that personal relationship with volunteers of the district and that sense of "belonging" to the weekly case conference, all of which combined go to make for efficiency. What then is the typical length of the term of service of district secretaries, of paid visitors, of volunteers?

Supervision also makes it possible for a social agency to guard against overwork on the part of its employees. If any group of workers need "to let go" and breathe deep in the interest of their work, it is social case workers. From the list of qualifications for social work already given, it is obvious that one possessing a majority of such qualifications can hope to retain them in season and out only by a balanced rational life of work, rest and recreation. Any departure from this is "penny wise and pound foolish," and the efficiency of any society which tolerates overwork over any length of time is to that extent impairing its present and future value. To know to what extent overwork is required or permitted, therefore becomes a test of no little importance. In connection with this, it would be well to know how much absence from work by employees is due to sickness.

Much that has been said of supervision applies equally to the supervision of the work of volunteers,[1] and some of it with even greater force. There is possibly greater need, for example, to fit the job to the volunteer at each stage of his or her development in order that interest may be maintained. There is doubtless greater need for instruction and encouragement, and there is, above all, need of supervision as a check on any possible mistakes

[1] The efficiency of the growing body of volunteers determines in turn much of the efficiency of the work of the society. This is independent of the fact that volunteers prove an effective means of creating an intelligent public opinion not only as to sound principles of social case work but also as to the causes of many social maladjustments.

in carrying out a plan of treatment due to errors of one kind or another on the part of the volunteers. It, therefore, follows that any complete list of tests of efficiency must answer the question, is there adequate supervision of the work of volunteers, by either the district superintendent, visitation committees of volunteers, or some volunteer who has the gift of leadership and sees the value of volunteer service? The adequacy of the supervision can be tested in part by ascertaining whether the number of volunteers is increasing, why they withdraw, what is the range of services open to them,[1] and whether they themselves regard their services as valuable. Volunteers may work for years without grasping the full significance of their task because it has never been presented to them.

Training New Workers

Probably the biggest factor in all efficiency is training. It follows that that society is most efficient which has the best trained corps of workers, volunteer as well as paid. The development of training schools for social workers has helped solve the problem of the trained paid worker. Need for further specialized and technical training, however, still exists on the part of the graduates of these training schools on their entrance into the employ of charity organization societies.[2] Training schools have thus far done little toward the problem of training volunteers because they have drawn to themselves mainly those who enter the ranks of the paid worker.

In view of the above facts, an indirect test of the efficiency of a given charity organization society is found in the provisions it makes for training new workers, volunteer and paid. Does the district superintendent (or

[1] It should include for some, full case work experience as well as opportunities for clerical work or friendly visiting.

[2] There are furthermore not sufficient training schools to meet the needs of the country for trained workers.

general secretary, or his assistant in an undistricted society) give definite training to these new members of the staff on the day's work of the society? Is this supplemented by opportunities for attendance regularly at a training class for paid workers in which background is presented for the technical training in the district and the relation of case work to community programs is made clear? In addition to the new employees, it is in order to ask what opportunities are offered old employees for further development. Are seminars or study groups of superintendents arranged where problems of peculiar interest to themselves may be discussed under leadership? Are sabbatical half years, as in one society, afforded to workers for study, recreation or travel?

The need for opportunities for training for volunteers is probably even greater than for the paid worker who presumably comes with some training or experience. Are there regular training classes for volunteers? Are they graded to suit the varying needs of any body of volunteers,—for example, for beginners, for friendly visitors, etc.? Has the district superintendent time to know each volunteer in more than a superficial way? Can he or she help with suggestions? Have they a place in the district headquarters where they can come without feeling like intruders? Are the weekly case conferences so planned and conducted as to yield their maximum educational value for volunteers? Are old cases reported on from time to time and lessons indicated from some particular success or failure in the plan of treatment followed?

Maintaining Esprit de Corps

Effectiveness in social work is as much a matter of spirit as of mind or body. Every large business concern at all conscious of the lessons of social psychology not only recognizes the importance of developing and maintaining esprit de corps among its workers, but takes va-

rious steps to do so. It is too often assumed that the appeal of social work is such as to make unnecessary any conscious attempt on the part of social agencies to develop esprit de corps. Assuming as axiomatic that esprit de corps increases efficiency, it is in order to ask what measures are employed by a given society to this end. Is the atmosphere created by the executive head such as inspires loyalty in even the humblest worker? Are occasions regularly afforded for all the workers, irrespective of their tasks, to meet informally face to face? Is opportunity ever provided for members of boards of directors and workers to meet? Are there social gatherings, "parties," family dinners, etc., among the employees to arouse enthusiasm, acquaintanceship and esprit de corps? A conception of the greatness of one's task alone can produce the highest efficiency. Are there meetings of the staff, directors and volunteers for inspiration, instruction and exchange of experience?

The Society and the Public

As already noted, the second group of problems in the field of administration concerns the relation of the society in question to the public and introduces the following topics: Finance, Propaganda, Reports, Accessibility to those who desire to make use of it.

Finances

In addition to the problems common to financing any social agency not supported by taxation, a charity organization society presents some problems peculiar to itself. For example, an important function of a charity organization society is the education of the public to greater wisdom in its giving. Any methods of raising funds for a charity organization society which defeats this end is vicious, no matter how completely it fills the society's treasury. Or again, it is generally conceded that a large

pre-collected relief fund has a bad psychological effect on those persons in any community whose spirit of independence is in need of strengthening, and that it always has a tendency to become a substitute for good case work with its characteristic resourcefulness in meeting the financial side presented by many family problems. A satisfactory list of tests of efficiency covering this detail of organization must therefore include not only tests common to all self-supporting social agencies, but also some peculiar to charity organization societies.

While a budget relates directly to the expenditures of money since it is a program financially expressed, it should have an important bearing on every campaign for funds. By making for a more careful and wise expenditure of funds it also creates confidence in those entrusted with the public's money. It is a test of no little merit, therefore, to learn whether a given social agency has a real budget or only a statement of expenditures at the end of the year. To use money wisely is in the last analysis a more serious task than to get the money.

Judging the efficiency of a charity organization society by the standards of community needs in general, it is not out of place to ask whether the society in question articulates its financial plans and program with those of other social agencies in the community. This does not necessarily mean a financial federation, but a readiness to fit its financial campaigns into a program whose first aim is the greatest good to the community rather than to any particular social agency .

The methods of raising money for social agencies vary greatly. They include subscriptions based on general appeals either through the mails, the press, the platform or by personal solicitation, membership dues, benefits, tag days, personal subscriptions for individual cases and joint appeals for all approved social agencies of the city. It is obvious that these are not all equally efficient, especially when judged in the light of the accepted objects

of charity organization societies. By what tests may one judge the relative merits of these channels of reaching the public? In answering this question one must keep in mind the effect of the method in question on the society, on the public and finally on the clients of the society. Does the method under analysis create in the minds of those on the borderline between dependence and independence, the impression that an inexhaustible fund has been collected, into which they may dip for "their share"? For fear of this danger, some workers contend that there should never be general public appeals for relief. Above all, does the method used educate the public in principles of scientific case work or merely foster in the community the spirit of Lady Bountiful as is doubtless too often the fact when recourse is had to the institutions of charity balls, and bazaars, as sources of income. Does the method used make an appeal solely to a class or does it make for increasingly democratic support? The desirability of democratic support for a charity organization society illustrates the difference between certain standards that obtain in the world of business and the field of social work. In the former, the only test necessary is the cost of raising the dollar; in the latter, the number of individual contributions is equally vital. Few cognizant with the purposes of a charity organization society would contend that the more democratic basis of support entailing its greater expense does not represent a higher service to the community and hence greater efficiency. In-breeding of support and interest spells inefficiency in any line of social work. "Social work will not accomplish its really great purposes until it has mastered a way of getting the intelligent and contented support of a steadily expanding group of citizens." [1] It must ever work to reduce that large group of society who give neither time nor money to social agencies through lack of vital

[1] William J. Norton, "City Planning in Social Work," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 581 (1916).

interest in social welfare and to increase at least the group of paying citizens who give of their money. The ideal, of course, is to add the great mass of people to that small body of citizens found in every community who give freely of their time and money to further the interests of social welfare.[1] Accordingly, it is a test of no little importance for a charity organization society to know whether one person in 38 of the population contributes to its support or whether it is only one in 411;[2] whether the per capita contribution is five cents, ten cents, fifteen cents; or whether five per cent or fifty per cent of the subscribers have contributed for more than one year, for more than five, etc.

In addition to the question of utilizing the most efficient channels for raising a financial budget is the question of content of message used in reaching the pocketbooks of the community. Here again one must keep in mind that not relief of distress alone, but the correct education of the public in matter of the scientific principles of social case work and understanding of the social causes of poverty are parts of the program of every charity organization society worthy of the name. Does the appeal for funds, whether written or spoken, appeal solely to the emotions? Does it appeal to the head but only to miseducate, as when the appeal is to make the society a proxy in all the charitable relationships of life or support is urged on the basis of "saving" the contributor-to-be time and money? Does the message help build up an understanding of the great truth that in most social case work personal service, rather than material relief, is what counts for most, or does it make its appeal on the old-time plea that "every dollar given directly reaches the poor"? Is its method thus so unethical as to make the collection of its funds an obstacle to other socially

[1] See John Melpolder, "Democratizing Social Welfare Efforts," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 303-304 (1916).

[2] The figures are real and not fictitious. They illustrate the value of the test for the two cities from which they were taken.

necessary agencies in the collection of theirs? Finally, does the appeal foster the spirit of Lady Bountiful in the community or does it bring nearer the next step in an era of greater social justice?

Of the various methods of raising money the letter of appeal is that most frequently used. In some cases it is the only means. We shall accordingly consider in some detail standards and tests of efficiency that are applicable to it. Here the test of first importance is "cost of collection." Is it two per cent, five per cent, ten per cent of the total amount collected? [1] It is obvious that the cost of collection depends, in turn, on a number of factors each subject to its respective tests. The first of these relates to the "quality" of the appeal. Does the society employ a trained financial secretary? If it is not large enough for such a sub-division of labor, does it employ the best talent at its disposal in writing its letters of appeal? Is the job of reaching the potential contributors' altruistic nature taken as seriously as business concerns take the job of reaching man's self-interest through their campaigns of advertising? In short, does the quality of the appeal, both in wording and spacing used, compare favorably with the best standards employed in commercial advertising?

Probably the biggest single factor in reducing the cost of collection of funds is the care bestowed upon the mailing list of non-contributors. Does the society maintain such a mailing list? Is it revised annually? Are new names constantly added? Is there any conscious attempt to democratize it by including names of persons on none of the lists of subscribers to important philanthropies? Is the "appealee" ever given a chance to have

[1] The cost of collection of the United Charities of Chicago is about 2.9 percent of the total amount collected. A study by the Russell Sage Foundation shows that other leading charities in the United States of similar type have a somewhat larger collection cost but even those range from but 3 to 10 per cent. B. C. Roloff, "Profit in Appeals," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXVIII p. 280 (1917).

his name removed from the list by the use of a reply post-card?

Of equal importance with the thought bestowed on the list of non-contributors is the thought and time expended in cultivating the contributor's list. Is a study ever made of the financial death rate among contributors? If so, is it as low as fifteen per cent or as high as forty-eight per cent? Contributors are gained usually with considerable effort. One does not get the habit of contributing because of a single contribution. Are contributors thanked by personal letter in addition to formal receipt from the treasurer? Is educational work done all year by sending interesting accounts of the work of the society? [1] Does the annual report contain a clear-cut statement of stewardship for all funds collected? Is there intensive educational work done to deepen the interest of those who have contributed for the first time or to regain the interest of contributors whose gifts have lapsed for one or two years? Is any attempt made to develop gradually the interest of new contributors by letting them know something of the work done for individual families for whom their contributions are spent, thus utilizing the sound principle of pedagogy of beginning with the concrete and moving toward abstract principles later? Is there a conscious attempt to strengthen the interest of contributors by enlisting them, when possible, in some piece of volunteer service, *e. g.*, of turning to a contributor, who is a lawyer, for legal advice in connection with the society's work? Peoples' interest usually grows to the extent that they give of themselves, and this often but awaits a definite opportunity.

This leads logically to the question of financing case by case. This method, which is distinctive of charity organization societies, has great value, because it offers an opportunity to educate the giver and also

[1] The New York Society issues weekly bulletins describing in a most interesting fashion some one phase of its work. Its educational possibilities are limitless.

reduces the necessity for maintaining large precollected relief funds with their attendant evils. Some societies make considerable use of this method of finance having special committees on family appeals; other societies have made little or no use of it. It, therefore, becomes a matter of importance to know the extent of special family appeal work of a given society. It may run as high as forty per cent, or as low as twenty per cent, or less. All other factors remaining the same, it is more than likely that that society which raises the largest part of its funds by the case-by-case method is doing the best educational job.

Propaganda

Charity organization societies will be subject to criticisms of an unwarranted kind until they educate the public to the real meaning of family rehabilitation and the important part that non-material relief plays in all such work. This can only be done by persistent efforts at community education. Mention has already been made of various methods available for this purpose.[1] It only remains to point out some tests applicable in the field of propaganda. Does the propaganda, whether through the newspaper, the platform or the screen, bear the mark of sincerity, *i. e.*, is there an absence of the sensational, the overdrawn? Is the propaganda varied that it may hold public attention? Is it ethical in that any possible identity of a society's clients is guarded against? This means a prohibition of the use of any personal photographs. Is the work of the society ever kept in the foreground rather than the name of the general secretary?

The press in America is the great channel through which public opinion is moulded. Efficient propaganda implies an efficient use of this agency. Does the society have a press committee to aid in getting the work of the society into the newspapers at regular intervals? Much

[1] See page 457.

material can be put into the form of "news" that has educational value, which in any other form would be valueless from the newspaper point of view. If there is no such committee, is it the conscious policy of the society to develop confidence in its work and methods on the part of the various city editors and reporters? [1] Is material in the form of advance copies of reports on work done sent regularly to the newspapers? Are the newspapers supplied with "time copy" covering accounts of special activities conducted by the society, such as the work of a wayfarers' lodge, visiting housekeepers, etc.? Is this material presented in a form that is dignified and yet journalistic? .

Annual Reports

An annual report is an account of stewardship and a record of work. It may be more by adding certain educational features for propaganda purposes. It, however, should never be less.[2] In the following discussion we shall assign to the annual report but one function, namely, "to report," assuming that all propagandist material is published separately as circulars or bulletins.

As trustees of other peoples' money and dependent upon public confidence for their fullest measure of usefulness, charity organization societies should seek to gain this confidence by an intelligent presentation of receipts and expenses. As such societies are in reality public service corporations, they should have no secrets from the public.

No complete science of report-making has as yet been

[1] One means of developing confidence is for the general secretary and as many of his staff as possible to become specialists in some field allied to the work of the society, e. g., vagrancy, desertion and non-support, disaster relief. Monographs' and newspapers' interviews carefully prepared go far in creating confidence based on a sound policy of publicity.

[2] For an interesting plea for making the annual report reportorial rather than educational and propagandist see Karl de Schweinitz, "An Anatomy Most Melancholy," *The Survey,* Vol. XXXV, pp. 509-510 (1916).

formulated, but many valuable methods have been wrought out by one society or another in the attempt to meet their own special needs. With these as a basis and in the light of the accepted object of all annual reports, certain tests of efficiency suggest themselves. It is axiomatic to say that a report succeeds or fails as it invites reading or not. The first test, therefore, relates to appearance. Is it pleasing in appearance? Does the typography, the spacing, use of illustrations and kind of paper each in turn conduce to reading? Once the report is in the reader's hands, does its size invite one to go through it from cover to cover, or is it filled with extraneous matter such as a copy of the constitution and by-laws, names of the former presidents, etc.?

Is the matter presented in a simple and direct fashion? Does the report stress the achievements of the society rather than call attention to personalities, be they directors or members of the paid staff? Does it present a condensed and connected story of the year's activities or merely string together a number of separate reports giving the activities of each of a number of departments or committees probably written by as many people?

If illustrations are used, do they illustrate or merely occupy space that had better been used for other purposes? Are they well proportioned or do they sprawl over the page? Is greater use made of line drawings which are cheaper and believed by many advertisers more effective than is made of photographs? Are all diagrams used so accurately drawn as to tell the truth and so clearly presented as to need little explanation which, however, is always explicitly given where needed?

Finally, is there some degree of uniformity in the use of statistics, and is there any attempt to work out a more or less standardized financial statement? [1]

[1] See Charity Organization Statistics, Report of the Committee on Statistics of the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity published by the Charity Organization Department, Russell Sage Foundation (1915).

Accessibility

The last set of tests relates to the accessibility of charity organization societies to those who desire to use them. It is obvious that the first essential to accessibility is, to be known. The question of publicity has already been discussed. Even after the work of a social agency is known, it is possible to encourage its use by the public. This does not mean that a charity organization society ought or could be a substitute for all the personal charity of a community. It does mean, however, that no individual or church should aid a family without first learning, through the social service exchange, whether such a family is known to the C. O. S. or some other social agency. Are charitably disposed citizens encouraged to use the exchange? If there is no municipal or other local provision for housing the homeless, does the C. O. S. maintain a Wayfarers' Lodge that is always open or make other provision so that no citizen accosted by a man or woman asking a night's lodging need feel compelled to give money to the applicant under conditions which usually make a knowledge of the facts impossible. Does the society provide the public with tickets good for a night's lodging with directions for locating the shelter clearly indicated?

An important element in accessibility is, of course, the numbers of hours a day that the offices of a charity organization society are open alike to the public at large and to clients. How many hours a day are the district offices open? Practice varies, the range being from two hours to all day, while in at least one city the central office is kept open until midnight. The knowledge of such an office being closed has an unfortunate effect on the amount of indiscriminate giving on the street that goes on to a greater or less degree in every community. A charity organization society which has its doors open to the poor and rich alike during a full working day is ren-

dering more efficient service to its community than one which is open but half the time.

Finally, does the society assume that "the poor" will always turn to a charity organization society if in want? To assume so is to lose sight of the universal facts of pride, sensitiveness, misunderstanding and inertia existing in all classes. A charity organization society living up to its ideals will strive to have its office as dignified and as accessible as those of a local doctor or public health center. While interviews will, whenever possible, be conducted in the home of the client, as already pointed out, privacy should be provided at the office of the society for those instances when a home interview is not possible. It is not too much to expect the district office of a charity organization society to become a kind of neighborhood center for those seeking advice of one kind or another. The test here is similar to one already proposed, namely, are the clients of a charity organization society like the satisfied customer who tells others of the satisfactory service that he has enjoyed?

CHAPTER XII

PREJUDICES AND CRITICISMS

THE path of the critic is at all times fraught with pitfalls. It is especially so when his subject is a movement stretching back almost half a century and including within its scope units in all stages of development. Generalization is therefore difficult if not impossible. Throughout, the reader should remember that it is one thing to say that the charity organization movement is a failure and another thing to point out wherein the movement has failed.

As an institution is sometimes unfairly criticized for being something else than it is, it is well to recall that a charity organization society "does not attempt, as an organization, to eliminate poverty. If that were its purpose, it would be stamped as a failure from beginning to end. It agrees with the keenest sociologists of our time that far-reaching and radical reforms are needed for this. What it does aim to do, is to relieve distress wisely and sympathetically, and to interpret to the community, the facts concerning the extent and degree of poverty, so that the community itself, knowing well the nature of the evil, may be able to apply the remedy." [1] A charity organization society's especial concern is family rehabilitation,[2] *i. e.*, the restoration of dependent families to a normal life of independence by a plan of "treatment" based on a careful study of each family coming under its care, and only indirectly is it concerned

[1] Annual Report of the Associated Charities of Colorado Springs, 1911, p. 7.

[2] For a more detailed discussion of the nature and function of a charity organization society, see Chapter IV, pp. 94-113.

with attacking the adverse social conditions making for poverty. This does not mean that many charity organization societies have not directly taken part in attacking the social causes of exploitation and hardship, such as unsanitary housing, child labor, extortionate charges by pawnshops, salary loan and chattel mortgage agencies and uncompensated industrial injuries. However, the resources of the vast majority of societies are limited, and the values of specialization and division of labor inhere as much in social work as in any other field. "But that there are social causes of dependence and degeneracy, and that it is a proper function of organized charity to lay bare these causes and to aid in removing them, is long since established beyond question." [1]

Before discussing specific criticisms of the charity organization movement, reference should be made to that type of critic who condemns efforts at human amelioration as a violation of the processes of natural selection, fraught with grave dangers and often real evils.

The only answer which charity organizationists in common with other social workers can make to this type of criticism is that in the world as constituted to-day, irrespective of philanthropy, natural selection is often working far from eugenically. The institution of private property alone may make possible the survival of biologic weaklings, while the health of others eugenically born is not infrequently undermined by insufficient nourishment in infancy, by occupational disease or enforced residence in the noisome dwelling of some so-called slum.

Wherever individual charity organization societies fail to heed the lessons of McCulloch's study of the Tribe of Ishmael and Dugdale's study of the Jukes, they are more justly open to the criticism of the thoroughgoing evolutionist. It must, however, be borne in mind that

[1] Edward T. Devine, "Prejudices Against Organized Charity," an editorial, *The Survey*, Vol. XXVII, p. 1325 (1911).

during the first two decades of the movement, the public was apparently neither prepared, if indeed it is yet, for the program of segregating the feeble-minded nor even for a public hearing of the claims of eugenics. At the National Conferences of Charities and Correction, the problem of the feeble-minded was repeatedly stated, but it seldom got beyond this. Occasionally the wrong to society and to unborn children of keeping together parents mentally and physically below par was pointed out in an annual report of some society,[1] but little else happened. One cannot but regret that the appreciation of this wrong is too frequently lacking, even to-day, in the discussion of family problems, both by charity organization societies and child welfare agencies.

Critics of charity organization as a method of meeting the problem of human need divide themselves into three groups. There is first, that part of the Lay public who feel that so-called scientific charity has lost the warmth and value of the charity of an earlier day; second, the "radicals" who feel that all charity is merely palliative work and therefore out of place in the modern world, and third, social workers, often laborers, within the movement who believe that the movement has either fallen short of its possibilities or has drifted far from first principles.[2]

Some of the criticisms amount to nothing more than mere prejudices, but where such is the case the author does not believe that he is excused from attempting to reach a sympathetic understanding of the grounds under-

[1] Mr. Robert Treat Paine, in the 20th Annual Report of Boston Associated Charities declares: "Let civilization beware of promoting the birth of the most unfit, by keeping families together by public outdoor relief, when they had better be broken up, and would be broken up if left to themselves."

[2] There is still another class of critics, fortunately not large, which need not detain us here, since the burden of their charges are personal attacks on the character and honesty of social workers. Unfortunately their contributions gain a wider reading than they merit, because published by certain popular muck-raking magazines and newspapers with mud-slinging tendencies.

lying them. Still other of the criticisms show such superficial knowledge of the nature of a charity organization society and of the tasks that confront it that one would be tempted to pass them by were they less common or were they made with less enthusiasm for the common welfare. Some of the criticisms of the first two groups are mutually destructive, creating thereby the belief in more impartial minds that the truth lies somewhere between.

The Lay Public as Critic

Perhaps the most common criticisms of charity organization societies are the charges that they are "cold" and delight in "red tape." To such critics these societies exist "not to serve, but to search." To them a social investigation connotes the "third degree" of a police station. They believe that at best its only function is to corroborate the statements of the client. That both charges are foreign to the spirit of charity organization hardly needs to be reiterated here. That they are unfounded is the belief of the author based on close observation of a decade, covering a number of societies and a still larger number of workers in all sections of the country.

By this, the author does not mean that there is not, or possibly better, has not been, some real basis for this kind of antagonism. Authentic cases where a society has been informed after three weeks of investigation that it need not trouble itself further as the baby was dead and the mother probably dying, have been extremely rare in the history of the movement. All well equipped societies have their emergency relief work so well organized that they can guarantee prompt action with every case. The practice of granting whatever "interim relief" is necessary, pending an adequate investigation, is according to the writer's observation universal. Certainly the friends

of charity organization may never hope to see this criticism die unless such is the case.

It is easy to understand the origin of the criticism of "coldness" and "red-tape." The whole weight of tradition about giving to the poor apparently runs counter to discrimination in relief giving. "Let not your right hand know what your left hand doeth." "Give to him that asketh and from him that would borrow turn not away," are applied literally by many. Moreover, as the Webbs have pointed out, "there are still many good people among us who instinctively resent any discouragement of the personal impulse to give alms or to perform 'good works' as a religious duty by which we acquire merit or do glory unto God, quite irrespective of the effect really produced upon the recipients and beneficiaries. To them, at least in theory, personal charity is everything." [1] They comprise the ranks from which are recruited Lords and Ladies Bountiful. To them social service is not charity —never can be charity. It seldom occurs to Lord or Lady Bountiful that, although there is great warmth about their charity at the moment, it is often not the steady supply that persists in season and out, which characterizes all sincere sympathy for the distressed. Subscriptions to charity balls can hardly take the place of that personal interest of social workers in the less fortunate of the city, that extends through the long hot summers when many such subscribers are at shore or mountains.

On the score of "red-tape," it should be recalled that the attitude of mind that sees in social diagnosis and treatment an analogy to the diagnosis and treatment of a physician marks a big step in social thinking. It comes only as the result of some study and reflection on the problems of relief and often only as a result of practical experience in trying to solve them. The charge of too

[1] Sidney and Beatrice Webb, "The Prevention of Destitution," p. 222 (1911). The author hastens to add here that some of the staunchest defenders of the principles of charity organization are, and some of the pioneers in the movement, both in England and America were clergymen or laymen prominent in their respective denominations.

much "red tape" is quite naturally made by those who fail to see the frequent complexity of many social situations. Such being the case, it is not at all surprising that this charge also dies hard.

A criticism as widespread, if not as old as those just discussed, charges that under the methods of charity organization, "it costs a dollar to give a dollar away." The favorite form of this criticism is usually an analysis of the budget of the local charity organization society under the categories of salaries, printing and postage, carfare, rent, telephone, etc., and "relief." The results are then published in a local newspaper under some such startling caption as "If you give the ———— Charity Organization Society One Dollar, only Twenty-eight Cents of It Ever Reaches the Poor and Destitute."

The basis for this type of criticism is to be found in such dense ignorance as to the rudiments of the principles of charity organization that an attempt to answer it here would be impossible were not the major part of what precedes in this volume an answer in itself. Suffice it now to recall one or two salient points of such an answer. First, strictly speaking, a society for organizing charity is an agency whose very purpose is to correlate the services and relief, both personal and corporate, found in every city. It is not an additional relief society. Secondly, the unenlightened poor clamors for money (and the utterly unenlightened philanthropist joins his cry) as the ignorant sick do for medicine. A doctor without medicine is often worth more than medicine without a doctor. Few complain because a doctor's services cost more than his medicine. The writer regrets that space does not permit a rehearsal here of typical case histories that illustrate the truth that material relief is but an incident to the work in hand of the family social agency.[1] On an average, two families out of every three under the care of charity organization societies do not require as-

[1] See case history given on pp. 139, 140.

sistance in the form of groceries, clothing, or other material things. For the remaining third, the skilled worker uses relief incidentally precisely as the physician uses his material aids and equipment. It is the skill of the physician and the intelligent work done by the trained case worker that count.

Not only does the criticism in question carry little weight because it entirely misunderstands the nature of the work which it criticizes, but it is unfair in trying to state that which it is impossible from the very nature of the case to state. Charity organization societies cannot tell what it costs to administer relief because it has no agents or machinery engaged in that activity. "How," asks a leader in the movement, "can a school tell what it costs to administer the crayon and ink used in the education of pupils, or a doctor what it costs to administer his medicines, or an inventor what it costs to administer the supplies of his laboratories?" [1] As another leader asks, "When people manufacture shoes, do they charge up the cost of all labor that goes into their making to the administration account? What is spent in the office of a charitable society on a bookkeeper, on a collector, on office rent, on gas, on heat, should be charged to the administration account; but what is spent on the labor of devoted men and women who give their lives to mending the broken fortunes of the needy, doing for them every conceivable service from the lowliest to the highest, surely to charge all that against the cost of 'giving away a dollar' is a very stupid thing." [2]

Beside the foregoing objection to the method of figuring the cost of "giving a dollar away," there remains the further objection that every charity organization society is instrumental in securing from kith and kin of the unfortunate, his friends, church, lodge, etc., considerable

[1] E. T. Devine, "Prejudices Against Organized Charity," an editorial, *The Survey*, Vol. XXVII, p. 1326 (1911).
[2] M. E. Richmond, "The Good Neighbor," pp. 137-138 (1908).

sums for his use. These amounts in toto often greatly exceed the money invested in the salaries of the workers in question. These funds, however, play no part in the figures which go to make up the budget, on the analysis of which is based the charge that it "costs a dollar to give a dollar away." Ignoring, therefore, the value of the work of these visitors in stimulating the motive power that enables dependent families to lift themselves into independence, the workers often repay their salaries in the money and services they secure from outside sources for their clients. This ignores still further the worth to the rest of the community of families that are self-supporting rather than dependent.

The mischief which this type of criticism does is often far-reaching. In more than one small community the work has remained in a weak condition because those in control, fearing the criticism just discussed, have failed to pay an adequate salary to secure the kind of services necessary. Truly, the laborer is worthy of his hire and in no field is second-rate service more expensive than in that of charity organization.

The persistence of this particular criticism is due in part to the slowness whereby the public gains an understanding of the principles of scientific charity [1] and in part to a policy on the part of certain "yellow" journals whereby they hope to gain favor by exploiting a popular prejudice even though it involve a pernicious distortion and suppression of essential facts.

Some in the movement have also been partly responsible by the apologetic attitude that they have taken toward the question of overhead expenses. When after two decades, the secretary of one of the oldest societies in the country stated in a public meeting and apparently

[1] As early as 1882 the founder of the Buffalo Society wrote "The only serious objection, however, which has been made to the Society's plan is on the score of *expense*." S. H. Gurteen, "Handbook of Charity Organization," p. 64.

with pride, "that not one cent of the money contributed to it by the public is used for running expenses," [1] it seems as though the day were far distant when the "expenses of administration" might be viewed as so much the best use a society makes of its money that one could almost wish it all went that way. Some day it may.

The Radical as Critic

The background of the next group of critics is usually quite different from that of those whose views have already been discussed. The first group do not oppose charity organization societies because they are charitable, but because they are not charitable enough. The present group of critics is opposed to charity because to them it is a poor substitute for social justice. If relief is ever needed, it should be public rather than private because it will partake more of the nature of justice and less of the nature of charity. The first group are usually the conservatives, while the second group draws its strength from the radicals. This does not mean, however, that a socialist, single taxer or capitalist may not believe in the principles of charity organization.

In criticizing private charity, the radicals point out that it is always in danger of being influenced by the sentimental considerations of its financial supporters. This they contend is far less true of a public relief system which is a part of the vast machinery of government. It is further pointed out that private charity is more likely to injure the self-respect of the poor than public charity, especially if it is possible to develop a sentiment that public relief is the right of those who need it and therefore not stigmatizing. Such critics maintain that it is impossible to develop any such sentiment with respect to private charity.[2] With what ought to obtain rather than

[1] Anon., *Charities*, Vol. V, No. 27, p. 13 (1900).
[2] Maurice Parmelee, "Poverty and Social Progress," pp. 269-275 (1916).

with what actually does obtain, we are not here concerned. The present facts on each of the above counts, as far as charity organization societies are concerned, give such criticisms little more than academic interest. In the first place, on the whole, the least sentimental and least degrading system of relief obtaining to-day is that of charity organization societies. Any student knows that public out-door relief in America to-day with the possible exception of not over a dozen instances, is characterized by inadequacy, sentiment and loss of self-respect. That such should not be the case and that many charity organization workers wish that such were not the case, does not alter the grim facts as to the relative failure to date in America of public out-door relief. Surely until this is changed, charity organization societies should not be criticized for stepping into the breach. They may be more justly open to criticism if they oppose state action, qua State action. The State cannot do its work unless it is moralized and vitalized by the individual. If charity organizationists, because of a Spencerian interpretation of the functions of the State, withhold their sympathy and help from all State efforts toward social reform, then indeed they must face the criticism of many forward looking and liberal thinkers. Although family case workers are usually quite practical as to what to expect under present conditions in the way of high standards of case work in public departments, few, if any, of the present-day leaders of the movement withhold either sympathy or help from any honest effort on the part of public officials to improve the quality of their work. The charity organization movement in America is standing increasingly for better standards of work rather than for any theoretic distinction as to whether the work be done publicly or privately. At worse, it would be hardly fair to charge its followers with more than too negative an attitude toward governmental action.

A more serious objection to charity organization socie-

ties from this group of critics is that to a considerable extent such societies stand in the way of fundamental reforms which would remove, in part or entirely, the conditions of poverty which they try to ameliorate. Their work is held "second best," a palliative, not the real thing, not "drastic." In short, it is held that charity is concerned with the effects rather than with the causes of poverty. Sometimes such criticisms come from quite sympathetic sources, as is evidenced by the following:

"I am trying to do what I can to relieve those who are suffering or without opportunity," writes such a critic, in reply to an appeal for funds made by a charity organization society, "but long experience and observation have convinced me that benevolent donations can do little more than relieve a few scattered cases of distress. While one family or individual is being raised from degradation by the strenuous efforts of the charitably inclined, another family or individual—next door perhaps—is plunged from self-respect into degradation by economic pressure. . . ." This writer concludes, "And so, though I sympathize with you as with all who are trying to serve humanity, I must refuse your appeal." [1]

The point of view here expressed is by no means novel nor in some of its aspects is it limited to those outside the movement. As early as 1893, Robert Treat Paine, in an address read at the International Congress of Charities, Correction and Philanthropy at Chicago, raised the question:

"Has not the new charity organization movement too long been content to aim at a system to relieve or even uplift judiciously by single cases without asking if there are not prolific causes permanently at work to create want, vice, crime, disease, and death, and whether these causes may not be wholly or in a large degree eradicated? If such causes of pauperism exist, how vain to waste our

[1] See Letter to The Survey by Frederic Almy, *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 431 (1915).

energies on single cases of relief, when society should rather aim at removing the prolific sources of all the woe." [1]

Again no less a leader in the movement than the founder of the New York Charity Organization Society, Josephine Shaw Lowell, wrote in similar vein: "If the working people had all they ought to have, we should not have the paupers and criminals." [2]

It may be pointed out in passing that those who wrote in the foregoing vein can hardly be justly charged with either too great a pre-occupation with the relief of distress rather than with its prevention or too great an emphasis on the factor of character in poverty and too little on that of environment. It must be admitted, however, that many contributors to present-day charity lack social vision. Having no idea of the social causes of poverty they still divide all poor into "worthy" and "unworthy."

To the charge of family social work being palliative, the obvious answer is that we have with us here and now, people in distress, victims, granted, of great social maladjustments and, if you like, of an entirely wrong economic system, but nevertheless—people in misery and distress. To those who cry "justice, not charity," it should be pointed out that there is no justice in letting a tubercular man with five little children dependent upon him for support, die of the disease, when charity may be the only means of restoring him to health. It is not justice to let a widowed mother go out and toil all day in a laundry, when charity may keep her at home with her children. To do away with charity because the world is still unjust would be like doing away with the relief work of the Red Cross because we have not abolished war. We cannot sacrifice the victims of *present-day in-*

[1] See Bliss, Encyclopedia of Social Reform, p. 936 (ed. 1908).
[2] W. R. Stewart, The Philanthropic Work of Josephine Shaw Lowell, pp. 358-359 (1911).

justice, to an ideal justice of the future. Few will deny that humanity alone demands that human beings shall not starve in our midst. Our altruistic instincts whose roots run back to a time before the dawn of history would probably not permit of such a course even if our inherited traditions of religion and humanitarianism did. The sentiments of justice, of brotherhood and all the finer social emotions upon which the progress of society depends demand that these individuals shall be aided in the spirit of social solidarity—the spirit of charity. The brotherhood of the future, whether it be that of the régime of Socialism, of the Single Taxer or of any other group, will be long delayed if the spirit of brotherhood as it may now find expression in individual or collective charitable efforts is not only tolerated but intelligently encouraged.

In short, the roots of both charity and social justice are so intertwined in the soil of social solidarity that we cannot uproot one without uprooting the other. "Charity and Justice are not opposed, but supplementary terms. Charity is the forerunner and guide of social justice, always breaking new ground and preparing the way for its sister, Justice." The charity of to-day becomes the justice of to-morrow, but with this done, charity does not cease to exist. In one sense, the end and aim of all charity is no charity; in another, the end and aim of all charity is more charity. There is a charity that is a substitute for justice; of this we can never have too little. There is also a charity that goes hand-in-hand with justice; of this we can never have too much. "The spirit of charity still seeks adequate expression, refusing to be content with the smaller things thus far accomplished in her name. She asserts her right to be against every assault, relinquishing with joy to justice or to enlightened selfishness each separate task which she has taught man to perform for man, but finds straightway other means of lightening the load of sorrow and of sin, of giving hope and peace where selfishness and justice have still been

blind." [1] In short, the justice of to-day was the charity of yesterday. Charity to-day may be justice to-morrow.

Charity is the basis of much present-day justice. It may also be the superstructure built upon foundations of to-day's view of what constitutes social justice. Thus, charity to-day may step in "to relieve the situation where justice has partially failed." [2] It becomes in a sense "affectionate justice" in that it wisely combines heart with head just as St. Paul combined head with heart when he writes on the one hand of a love of one's kind, greater than that expressed in bestowing all one's goods to feed the poor, or giving one's body to be burned, and on the other, "If any man will not work, neither shall he eat." [3]

All other arguments aside for the present, the problem narrows down to a choice between relief that is chaotic and pauperizing and the treatment of a family in distress in a way that is constructive in so far as it endeavors to help its members out of their poverty rather than to help them in their poverty. That some are engaged in the work of prevention should not blind their eyes to the fact that they are free to devote all their time to such work because others are caring for the immediate problems of distress. The writer is not unmindful of the fact that there remains the question of the relative amounts of time and energy that wisdom dictates should be devoted to each kind of endeavor. Usually, however, an increase of one type of activity soon increases the amount of the other type of work. This, however, is not relevant to the present discussion. Both kinds of activity are needed. Society must care for its unfortunate members and at the same time not leave undone work preventing the needless production of more misery. Temperament and training

[1] Edward T. Devine, "The Spirit of Charity," *Charities,* Vol. VIII, p. 45 (1902).

[2] F. H. Wines, "Sociology and Philanthropy," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. XII, p. 55 (1898).

[3] II Thessalonians, III; 10.

may be the best guide for each individual as to where he or she shall put the emphasis, but it must ever remain true that while man is man, he cannot neglect his duty as citizen to help his neighbor in distress simply because he is interested in the large causes which promise big results in some distant or even near future.

It need hardly be pointed out here that such charity is not incompatible with the ideals of democracy, were not the movement the object of this study so frequently denounced as undemocratic. It should be recalled that the need for charity has ever been accepted by the most democratically minded. This harmony of ideals is quaintly expressed in the following address to the members of the Massachusetts Charitable Fire Society at their annual meeting in 1795:

"The necessity of charity is clearly announced by the whole structure of the human system. The sum of prosperity, like the natural sun of the universe, shines not with perpetual brightness anywhere. Clouds are always interfering and obstructing its genial influence and over whose head they will gather, or how long they will continue, is known only to Him whom the winds and clouds obey. If we enjoy the sunshine of the hour, it is equally our duty and our policy to relieve him who is suffering in the shade of adversity, and when, in turn, he enjoys the calm and we become involved in the tempest, we shall merit and if he possesses the gratitude of his nature, we shall receive of him a shelter from its inclemency." [1]

There is the same unquestioned acceptance of democracy and charity in the words of Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell:

"We must help people; we all need help, and always shall. Being finite beings, it is impossible to imagine that, in any future existence even, we should ever reach

[1] George R. Minot, An address to the Members of the Massachusetts Charitable Fire Society at their Annual Meeting, p. 11 (1795).

a point where we should be self-sufficient and need no help from others. Since, then, every human being needs help, it is of course the duty of every human being to give help." [1] History is replete with instances of the need of lifting from the shoulders of some, part at least, of the inevitable and heavy "costs of progress" that, by chance, fall to them.

Although a Mrs. Lowell may thus approach her task, it is true that the spirit of democracy is making rapid inroads into the so-called charitable relationship which too often obtains between benefactor and beneficiary. The complacency of the old-fashioned charitable individual is gone forever. Miss Jane Addams has well pointed out that "many of the difficulties in philanthropy come from an unconscious division of the world into the philanthropists and those to be helped. It is an assumption of two classes, and against this class assumption our democratic training revolts as soon as we begin to act on it. . . . Formerly when it was believed that poverty was synonymous with vice and laziness, and that the prosperous man was the righteous man, charity was administered harshly with a good conscience; for the charitable agent really blamed the individual for his poverty, and the very fact of his own superior prosperity gave him a certain consciousness of superior morality. Since then we have learned to measure by other standards, and the money-earning capacity, while still rewarded out of all proportion to any other, is not respected as exclusively as it was; and its possession is by no means assumed to imply the possession of the highest moral qualities. We have learned to judge men in general by their social virtues as well as by their business capacity, by their devotion to intellectual and disinterested aims, and by their public spirit, and we naturally resent being obliged to judge certain individuals solely by the industrial side for no other reason than that they are poor. Our democratic instinct

[1] Mrs. Charles R. Lowell, "The Evils of Investigation and Relief," *Charities*, Vol. I, p. 10 (1898).

constantly takes alarm at this consciousness of two standards." [1]

It now remains to ask whether family social workers as a group are conscious of the "two standards" to which Miss Addams takes exception.

Francis H. McLean replies: "There is nothing more finely democratic than real family social work. Its very fundamental purpose is to release the highest possible impulses of the families affected wherever those impulses are interfered with or handicapped by personal or groupal or social elements." [2]

Joseph Lee, long a student of modern philanthropy, in no uncertain terms, points out that the principles of modern charity are "fundamentally and characteristically democratic; that they are not only germane to the democratic spirit, but are a peculiarly authentic, accurate, and important expression of it." [3]

His reasons repay examination. In brief they are that both democracy and charity emphasize the value of the individual, and democracy "believes with modern charity that it is not what you do for a man, but what he works out for himself, not the government you give him, but that which he himself maintains, that makes the essential contribution to his life and character." [4] Again the great work of democracy is education and the methods of education in a democracy are "but the same methods that have been independently discovered by organized charity; the same methods, indeed, which will be followed wherever men are consciously and sincerely bent upon the development of the spiritual nature—upon the nurture of man as the spirit that he really is. The only difference is that in school these methods are applied

[1] Jane Addams, "The Subtle Problems of Charity," *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. LXXXIII, p. 163 (1899).

[2] Francis H. McLean, "On Making Our Societies Democratic," *The Family*, Vol. I, p. 9 (1920).

[3] Joseph Lee, "Charity and Democracy," *Charities and The Commons*, Vol. XVII, p. 388 (1906).

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 392.

not to the mature and unsuccessful, but chiefly to the young and normal life." [1]

Since the spirit and methods of modern charity and democracy are not incompatible, there exists an obligation on the side of both democracy and charity to see that any chasm due to misunderstanding is breached. Democracy must learn of the scientific technique and constructive methods of work that modern charity is evolving, and family social workers must strive to understand the ideals and humility of the truly democratic.

Charity Organization Workers as Critics

Satisfaction with one's achievement and not a consciousness of failure to reach one's ideal, is a grievous fault. If charity organization workers are at times critical of others, many have not failed to develop the critical faculty toward their own work. They know that a fine theory often finds safe and most comfortable harborage side by side with most commonplace practice. However, they recognize that, as already pointed out, it is one thing to say that a movement has failed and another matter to point out its failures.

One of the most frequent criticisms of charity organization work by leaders in the movement is the failure of many societies to resist the temptation of lowering their standards of work under the plea of overwork. This pressure of overwork is doubtless due in many places to the belief that the local charity organization society should have a monopoly of relief-giving. Rather than letting or encouraging others to give, some societies have helped this belief by creating the impression that dependency is their especial task. They have "pauperized" the charitable spirit in their respective communities and piled up tasks for themselves of such size that the financial burden has been too great for thorough case work,

[1] Joseph Lee, "Charity and Democracy," *Charities and The Commons*, Vol. XVII, p. 394 (1906).

and quantity rather than quality of service has almost unconsciously and inevitably been the result.

The realization of the danger of this condition has led those who hold high the value of having family social workers develop a sound technique of case work, to advocate that each society should limit the intake of its cases so as to improve the quality of the output on the theory that it is more important that charity organization societies should hold high the standards of case work than that they should attempt to take all cases that may be referred to them. This is in harmony with the conception of a charity organization society as merely a tool, whereby society in the more complex conditions of modern living may express some of its charity more efficiently than as an organization which claims a monopoly of all the work of family rehabilitation in a given community, thereby relieving individuals of their old-time obligations of true neighborliness. Should an emergency arise, it is further maintained that it is better in the long run to handle a few cases according to the highest standards, even though others may receive less thorough treatment, than to handle many cases half well. A high standard of work, so the argument runs, will not only in time create a demand for such a grade of work for all cases, but it has a most beneficial psychological effect on the daily practice of the case worker when the rush of work tends to hammer down all standards. The danger of "emergency habits" persisting after the emergency is over must be avoided.

Failure to limit intake to improve the quality of the output is often reflected in the matter of keeping case records. Much progress has been made in this direction.[1] It will be some time, however, before the rank and file of societies approximate in practice the standards already worked out.

[1] See Ada E. Sheffield, "The Social Case History" (1920). Also "Charity Organization Statistics," Russell Sage Foundation (1915).

Although the singling out of relief from the many features of work for needy families is to be deprecated, its importance has made it the subject of much discussion. Certainly an outstanding criticism of charity organization societies on the technical side of their work has centered about the adequacy of their relief work. That it has been inadequate has been admitted frankly by not a few workers in the ranks. In practically no place visited by the author was it admitted that the budget was anything like adequate to the demands made upon it. In supplying the material needs of the poor, too often have charity organization societies failed to live up to the accepted standards of living of our highest authorities. Too often have they been responsible for the growth of day nurseries. Too seldom have they worked to lessen their number.

It is apparent to the impartial observer that, not ignoring other factors, the one big fact will not down that had private charity been able to grant adequate relief to all its cases, especially to widows with children, the soil would not have been so well prepared for the acceptance since 1911 of the agitation for legislation for widows' pensions. When the public came to realize the fact that children were being separated from their mothers for the sole cause of poverty (it mattered not to them whether the percentage was high as the friends of widows' pension legislation claimed or low as the opponents proved), something had to be done. Opposition could not stem the tide. A new temper was abroad in the land. A putting forward of a program at the eleventh hour that claimed that the right solution of the problem was to work for measures that would cut down the number of widows and reduce the amount of inefficiency among those who remained, instead of turning to the state for adequate funds for present widows, came too late. Had charity organization societies frankly stated a decade earlier, the size of the burden of the widow with children that they were

struggling to meet, had they more boldly stated their need and advanced at the same time the supplementary program of prevention just mentioned, the writer questions in his own mind whether the country would have been swept by the wave of widows' pension legislation through which it passed, so much of which has been hasty and ill-considered. It is too early to tell in most, if not all places, just what the ultimate effect of this new type of legislation is to be. There are big obstacles that stand in the way of its ultimate success, but they are not insurmountable. Time alone will reveal. It may be that, as has recently been pointed out, such legislation may become the means whereby the public is to be educated in the principles of modern philanthropy.

It is sometimes charged that charity organization societies in common with all charity, tend to keep wages stationary, if not actually to reduce them. Irrespective of any English evidence to the contrary, there is little in the history of charity in this country to substantiate such a claim. Although charity organization societies may have been guilty of being niggardly in their standards of relief, there is little evidence that they have allowed what relief they did give to serve as a supplement to wages. Through their interest in workmen's compensation and the prevention of industrial accidents, family case workers, in common with all social workers, have endeavored to place on the shoulders of industry the burdens which it has largely created and often in the past escaped bearing. The knowledge of the principles of good case work reveals the falsity of the claim that material relief is granted to supplement the wages of the natural bread-winner, though such is almost always the case where the support of the family falls on a widow. While charity organization societies in their case work may not have had any influence on wages, either to lower or raise them, a study of their records does show that frequently what the poor lack is adequate wages. This fact should

never be hidden. However, to ask or to expect charity organization societies to affect by any *direct* means the present distribution of income is asking that they assume a rôle that, under the principle of the subdivision of labor, other groups can better enact.

A criticism to which charity organization societies in common with most social agencies are open is the charge that too often the directors of such organizations are in reality pseudo-directors. The experience of one worker active in the movement for a quarter of a century who had never had a board of directors to direct him even in general policies, may be exceptional. Naturally it appeals to the self-love to be urged to allow one's name to be placed on a list of directors with the assertion that the loaning of the name is a gift of exceptional value to the promotion of the good work. The result has been too great a yielding among influential people in allowing their names to be utilized for projects in which they have no personal responsibility or concern. Such directors do not direct. They let things drift into mere official routine and "leave direction more and more in the hands of a competent secretary, who is naturally embarrassed in telling his superior officers what they ought to do, and often accepts responsibility which does not really belong to him, because that is the easier way." [1] It is particularly necessary in the case of charity organization societies that they have strong boards of directors as they seek to develop considerable volunteer service. Volunteers cannot be enlisted and kept in line unless they feel that the members of the board of directors are themselves unselfish workers, actuated by the same motives that have brought them into the fellowship. The relative success of the movement in Boston, New York and Baltimore is due in no small degree to the personal interest which men of the calibre of the late Robert Treat Paine, Mr. Robert

[1] Alexander Johnson, "On Being a Director," leaflet, Series B, No. 4, published by The Russell Sage Foundation (1910).

W. deForest and the late John Glenn, all board members, manifested in the societies in Boston, New York and Baltimore, respectively.

The absence of a real partnership between the board of directors and the working staff leads to unfortunate results. Through a failure to appreciate standards of work, charity organization societies are frequently undermanned and the staff members underpaid. A ten-dollar-a-week clerk cannot make a social service exchange the instrument of coöperation that it should be. In fact, better coöperation all along the line waits until there are better paid, better trained and less worked assistants in charity organization society offices. These, in turn, await a fuller appreciation on the part of boards of directors of standards in case work.

The next criticism of charity organization societies is applicable equally to most other social agencies. From the point of view of office methods and administrative efficiency, charity organization societies are frequently poorly managed. Office devices for saving time and conserving energy of employees are missing. Efficiency in charitable work, as in any other field of activity, requires constant tests of efficiency which as was noted in the last chapter, are frequently conspicuous for their absence.

The most frequent criticism of the charity organization worker by social workers is his relative failure to educate the lay public in the fundamentals of family social work. Something is wrong when only nine societies of twenty invited to aid in an important study of the problem of the care of widows with children were able to complete the work that they had begun, even though the task was a heavy one.[1] Charity organizationists are prone to speak a technical language known largely to themselves alone. Those in the movement are charged with constituting a kind of secret society. Until charity organization work-

[1] See Mary E. Richmond and Fred S. Hall, "A Study of Nine Hundred and Eighty-Five Widows," Publication C. O. 34, Russell Sage Foundation, p. 8 (1913).

ers cease talking about investigation, registration and relief, terms which are not in the vocabulary of the general public, and show the public human beings in action and human things being done, they will have failed in cultivating that good will of the public essential to a lay appreciation of charity organization work. Too much advertisement, especially in the earlier days of the movement, has been given to the repressive side of charity organization, such as the suppression of street begging, and too little attention has been paid to informing the public of the positive and constructive work done in behalf of destitute families. People have been told not to give carelessly and selfishly, instead of being told to give carefully and thoughtfully. Because charity organization came as a reaction against sentimentality, it based its appeal too often to the head alone, forgetting entirely that the springs of action lie in the emotions. This defect is clearly illustrated by poor methods of advertising often employed. Annual reports can frequently be described by no more apt term than melancholy.[1]

The ignorance of charity organization principles comes out most markedly in times of emergency distress. The condition, however, always exists, as is obvious by the frequent attacks upon charity organization societies on the ground that money intended for relief is being spent on salaries. Even pastors of some large city churches, whose duties involve the frequent relief of distress, are ignorant of scientific principles of relief and sometimes even of the existence of the local charity organization society. More significant still are instances of certain individual churches being hostile to the work of the local society.[2] The attitude of many newspapers is such that

[1] Karl de Schweinitz, "An Anatomy Most Melancholy," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXV, p. 509 (1916).

[2] One of the main reasons for launching the Buffalo church district plan was the churches' "distrust of the Charity Organization Society (see pp. 243, 244). Mr. George S. Wilson (see footnote, p. 269) stated to the author that in Washington during the early years of the local society

much of what they print of the local charitable situation or much that they themselves undertake in the field of philanthropy clearly indicates that they have not been converted to the A. B. C.'s of modern philanthropy. Although many schemes launched by the press seem to be prompted by the desire for self-exploitation, others are clearly prompted by the most humanitarian, though misguided, of motives. Although the writer knows of societies which have made it a special point to educate the local newspapers in their work to the end that they might at all times count on their coöperation, and although he knows of other societies which have had a marked effect on the amount of indiscriminate giving obtaining in their respective communities, nevertheless it still remains true that, generally speaking, forty years after the movement was well launched, a difficult educational task still awaits the charity organization societies of the country. With the advent of the motion picture and the scenario, the progress of the next forty years may be much more rapid. There are indications that such may prove to be the case, though there is also the possibility that prejudices may be exploited by moving picture concerns as in the case of a film recently exhibited in one city, "The Blood-Red Tape of Charity," which attacked the methods of charity organization by a distortion of the facts.

As a result of this failure to educate the public, many who support the movement financially are socially blind, lacking vision. They still divide all the poor into "worthy" and "unworthy," ignorant of the many social causes of poverty. Their thinking has not arrived at the point of view that the one they deem most "unworthy" should often be given the greatest amount of study. The contributors are too often either those who have the benevolent point of view rather than a social point of view or those who believe that people "ought" to be so and so.

there was no constituency behind the Associated Charities and many clergymen were opposed to it.

Too seldom are they those who desire to understand others for the purpose of aiding them in working out their own adjustments or who wish to change those social conditions which conduce most often to poverty. In so far as the money-getting methods of charity organization societies substitute personal connections, society pressure or any other influence for an intelligent understanding of the causes of poverty and an appreciation of constructive case work, they have failed in one of their first functions—sound education.

The relative failure on the side of education of charity organization societies is reflected further in the frequent lack of hearty coöperation between social agencies and the local charity organization society, and this in spite of the fact that four decades have elapsed since coöperation was heralded as the watchword of the movement. One cannot help but wonder whether many charity organization societies have not been content with a type of petty coöperation when they should have stopped short of nothing but the whole-hearted type of coöperation that a campaign of education would have secured. Too often the local charity organization society is not popular with other social agencies.

The social service exchange is only now being introduced into the larger centers of population. Nowhere are inquiries of the exchange universal and in many places it is far from it. Coöperation is still in many places a phrase to conjure with, a paper plan, but not a habit of mind. It may be that in part this is explained by the fact that a charity organization society is a social agency like any other; and every corporate agency, feeling itself in rivalry with the rest, is likely to be somewhat jealous of every other one. Popularity is not the first or last test of value. A movement that came as a reform must share the unpopularity of most reforms. Not peace, but a sword has been and must be at times the means to a high end. Nevertheless, too often a "close

corporation" attitude combined with a tendency to reach down to lift rather than of getting under to raise up, has been responsible for this unfortunate position. Fortunately, this condition is passing in many places as a younger group of professional workers, often trained in the same professional school, are putting into practice real coöperation, irrespective of possible jealousies of boards of directors or any traditional rivalries that may have obtained in the past.

An almost equally serious result of lack of popular appreciation of its work is the relatively small percentage of those who are financially able in any community who support the local charity organization society. This unequal incidence of cost, charity organization societies experience in common with most other social agencies. It is held, moreover, by some "a distinct disadvantage that those who actually bear the cost of these agencies are few and far between, and the bulk of citizens are excluded from a charge to which all should contribute according to their ability. This characteristic incidence of the cost of all private philanthropy amounts, in effect, to a penalty on the good and conscientious; and is, at the same time, equivalent to a bounty on those who are selfish and without public spirit." [1] This brings up squarely the old controversy regarding the respective merits of public and private outdoor relief discussed elsewhere.[2]

The most serious result of lack of public understanding and support is the fact that in many places charity organization societies are finding themselves unequal to the financial strain which rising standards of work are placing upon them.[3] The question has been raised by several prominently identified with the movement whether

[1] Sidney Webb, "The Extension Ladder Theory of the Relation between Voluntary Philanthropy and State and Municipal Action," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXI, p. 704 (1914).

[2] See pp. 500, 501.

[3] See Gertrude Vaile, "Some Social Problems of Public Outdoor Relief," *The Survey*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 15 (1915).

charity organization societies have not done more harm by the niggardliness of their relief grants than they have done harm by making them too lavish. This failure in meeting the demands of adequate relief explains, in part, as pointed out, the rapid spread throughout the country of widows' pension legislation. That charity organization societies could accomplish far more with greater resources is a belief held almost universally by those in the movement. In the writer's experience there was but one general secretary who admitted that his work was not hampered to a greater or less extent by lack of funds.

The difficulty of raising sufficient funds has led some societies to adopt the questionable practice of accepting subsidies from public funds. Fortunately it is not general enough to be cited as typical of the movement. The state or municipality has no right to divert money raised by taxes to the support of any private undertaking until all its own wards are taken care of and for most communities this will not be until a day quite distant. The subsidy system opens the door for all other charities to ask like favors, and experience has shown that the line between sectarian and non-sectarian has been difficult to draw in practice. Moreover, the subsidy system places in the hands of the political party in power a means to curry for popular favor at the poles by pointing to their generosity in contributing to a local charity. Last, but not least, those responsible for the outlining and executing of the policies of the local charity organization society will be happier and more highly esteemed by critics of municipal life if they can accomplish their good deeds without submitting themselves to the theories and practice of the leading politicians in order to secure funds.[1]

The most serious criticism of many charity organiza-

[1] It should be borne in mind that what is stated above, while backed up by the sound experience of many leaders in the field, is written rather to indicate the dangers that lurk in accepting public subsidies than to brand all societies which to-day are accepting such subsidies as tools of any political power.

tion societies is their failure to make case work an engine of social improvement. These societies have lost sight of their community responsibility for the development of those social movements that grow out of their case work. Such societies are scientific merely in the sense of efficiency in their technique. They are not scientific in seeking out causes. One does not need to hold the position that the abolition of poverty is the function of the charity organization society to maintain that it is the responsibility of every charity organization society "to interpret to the community, the facts concerning the extent and degree of poverty, so that the community itself, knowing well the nature of the evil, may be able to apply the remedy." [1] If the community is not to receive these facts from those, like family social workers, who have first-hand knowledge of the problems involved, to whom shall it turn? It is the generalizations based on such first-hand observations and study as case workers can make that give the soundest basis for those programs of prevention that strike at the roots of poverty. The family case worker "should connect the neighborhood needs and the neighborhood points of view with the large needs of the community, and then work persistently for the legislative and administrative reforms that are found in all this careful, detailed service to be practical." [2] The writer was present at an address by the general secretary of one of the oldest and largest societies when he admitted that "some day" they would get to the task of tabulating and interpreting the mines of facts which they had accumulated in the years of their work, but that up to the present they had been "too busy" doing the routine of the day's work. The great danger of the "busy" worker is the failure to recognize the significance of certain recurring factors in his or her cases. Some societies have met this problem, in part at least, by the

[1] Report of the Associated Charities of Colorado Springs, p. 8 (1911).
[2] Mary E. Richmond, "The Good Neighbor," p. 105 (1908).

creation of statistical departments where all statistics are handled. There are, however, but relatively few societies who use even the statistical card.

The writer cannot but feel that no day should be too full to make it possible for the workers to translate their cases into social problems and that no occasion should pass when their significance is not pointed out to the public. If this is not done, then indeed are charity organization workers in an endless treadmill, going through the motions of their daily tasks, but never getting beyond them.

The late Canon Barnett may have been right when he said, "Perhaps it is because they (charity organization workers) have been such 'deadly doers' that they have (comparatively speaking) done so little. If they dreamt more of the ideal, which is so far off, but nevertheless along their own line of work, they would attract the forces that lie around, and attraction is, after all, the best method of organizing." [1]

Certain it is that the movement is suffering to-day from a lack of a sufficient number of broadly visioned and adequately trained personnel. Those in the movement who wish to attract to their ranks the forward-looking youth of to-day can be content with no slogan short of "the abolition of poverty." [2] The best minds of to-day, minds mature in knowledge of the world's complex problems and ills, nevertheless believe that no problem, including that of poverty, can indefinitely remain unsolved in the face of applied science and applied religion.

[1] S. A. Barnett, "Wanted—A Poet," *Charities*, Vol. II, p. 3 (1899).

[2] Perhaps none has done more to popularize this phrase than Edward T. Devine, for many years secretary of the New York Charity Organization Society. An interesting book with this title has come from the pen of Jacob H. Hollander (1914). That poverty is needless is the thesis put forward in "Essays in Social Justice," by Prof. Thomas Nixon Carver (1915).

CHAPTER XIII

THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHARITY ORGANIZATION

"It may be granted at once," writes one, long a leader in the movement, "that the representatives of organized charity have not adopted any special system of political economy or social philosophy. They do not aim to present a common front either of support or antagonism towards the diverse schemes of social reform and improvement. They are not, as a body, free traders or protectionists, single taxers or socialists, prohibitionists, trade unionists, populists or expansionists." [1] In short, "charity organization has never pretended to have a complete social program." [2] Family social workers view their modest day's work as independent of any one system of social philosophy. It is for this reason that a socialist, single taxer or capitalist may be and sometimes is a family social worker. Philosophies of poverty vary from that of one worker who admitted with pride that he was old-fashioned enough to believe that "suffering and poverty are needed to develop character," to that of a secretary of an old-established society who remarked to the writer that he was largely interested in his job that he might help to raise the poor to a point where they would have enough surplus energy to protest successfully against the many injustices of the present social order.

In spite of the foregoing, it cannot be said charity organization holds no "point of view," no ideals to claim

[1] Edward T. Devine, "Relief and Care of the Poor in Their Homes," *The Charities Review*, Vol. X, p. 335, (1900).

[2] M. E. Richmond, "What is Charity Organization," *The Charities Review*, Vol. IX, p. 498 (1900).

the loyalty of its followers. In a movement which includes within its ranks trained workers and workers untrained but with experience, volunteer workers of various degrees of training and experience, directors and contributors, one is ever in danger of either attributing points of view to many in the movement who do not hold them or claiming for family social workers a monopoly of certain points of view toward social welfare and social progress which, as a matter of fact, are shared by many not identified with the movement.

Several points of view seem to the author to characterize charity organization workers. First and foremost is the belief that altruism, mutual aid, charity is a social force not to be despised and rejected in social reconstruction.

"It recognizes gladly that there are other and more powerful social forces in the world that are working for its regeneration; but it affirms that charity, too, is a great social force. Its own task is to do what it can to make this force more effective, and it will not abandon this task for any other, however attractive; in the accomplishment of its chosen work, it coöperates heartily with workers of every variety of social belief." [1] The charity organization movement owes its origin not to the fact that people are poor, but because others are charitable. Realizing that the impulse of altruism may do harm as well as good, charity organization would utilize this force as an aid in social advance.

Charity is viewed then not as a "general philanthropy or any of the diverse forms of relief," but as "a social principle." [2] In short, charity is held to be a factor in social evolution and the methods of charity organization are evolutionary.

In common with many others, charity organization workers view with little favor a social order in which the

[1] M. E. Richmond, "What is Charity Organization," *The Charities Review*, Vol. IX, p. 498 (1900).

[2] C. S. Loch, "Methods of Social Advance," p. 189 (1904).

State is overlord, and individual initiative and responsibility are reduced to a minimum. Their point of view is one which considers the State as a social institution neither friendly nor hostile with independent personality, but as "a very vital part of ourselves, as an extension of our will, our conscience and our strong right arm, as a tool to work with. . . ." [1] "The ideal" of charity organization workers "is that of a society which is by no means entirely dependent upon the government for meeting its corporate needs, which uses the State increasingly . . . but uses increasingly also other instruments for executing the social will, which looks upon a voluntary association, a chamber of commerce, a political party, or a newspaper as equally appropriate, within its limits, sometimes very wide limits, for accomplishing any beneficent purpose." [2]

In other words, society needs an unofficial as well as an official government to get all its work done well. Even were all public outdoor relief administered wisely, it is likely family social workers would not be content with a straight-out official relief policy. There is always the need for a careful study on the part of interested citizens of the kind of work a public agency is doing, but more important still is the need for evolving better and still better standards of work and the slow education of the public to a demand for the same. Experience seems to indicate that this can best be accomplished by a private agency in its capacity of a "free lance." Adds Francis H. McLean: "The official, through his administrative and legislative machinery, and the private citizen, working through his private agencies, are absolutely two equally necessary essentials for a proper development." [3]

The family social worker is neither alarmed by the

[1] Edward T. Devine, "Some Ideals Implied in Present American Programs of Voluntary Philanthropy," Publications of the American Sociological Society, Vol. VII, p. 179 (1912).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 181.

[3] Francis H. McLean, "Getting Ahead of Social Problems," *The Survey*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 418 (1912).

growth of state action nor obsessed by the desire to increase it for its own sake. The only test applied is the pragmatic one, namely, which, state or private action, gives better results under the circumstances obtaining. Child labor legislation, housing laws, public health measures, recreation legislation have all received most enthusiastic and consistent support from charity organization societies. On the other hand, "like Chalmers, organized charity of to-day, when unadulterated, fears the gift-bearing types of social legislation," but such fear is not founded on a belief in a Spencerian theory of laissez faire, but rather on an opposition to a wholesale handling of relief problems from precollected relief funds such as too frequently characterizes public outdoor relief and emergency relief measures, because, judged by general results, they fail to accomplish their object.

Charity organization workers stress individual initiative and responsibility because they count as one of the great facts of life which is to be welcomed that each must learn in the last analysis to bear his own burdens, to live his own life and to do his own work. They believe that the ability "to paddle one's own canoe" is always worth conserving, that self-direction is a real social value. "The ideal of an independent citizen of an industrial democracy, earning his own living, providing for his own emergencies, and relying for support even in old age on the accumulated savings of his productive period" [1] is still the inspiration of the great majority in the charity organization movement. What is here said of the individual applies with equal force to the family. It is held a big responsibility for society to interfere in the self-maintenance and self-direction of a famliy, and such interference should never occur unless the family falls so far below accepted standards as to make necessary social interference.

[1] Edward T. Devine, "Social Ideals Implied in Present American Programs of Voluntary Philanthropy," Publications of the American Sociological Society, Vol. VII, p. 188 (1912).

It should not be assumed that, because charity organization workers seek to rediscover the individual by the case work method, they fail to appreciate the social causes of poverty. It is one thing to view defective character as the prime cause of poverty and another thing to believe that adequate treatment may require in an individual case a study of the personality of the client.[1] It is one thing to view personal service as a panacea for all cases of distress and another thing to say that, in treating those particular cases of distress in which the individuals concerned have been beaten in the fight for the mastery of their own characters, there is no means so effective as the individual and personal method. In *such* cases charity organization workers believe that men and women are not aided in masses, but by the contagion of personality, and that methods of personal contact, of example, of suggestion, will always be needed and in some things will always get better results than legislation. This is becoming increasingly to-day the method of medicine, penology and education as well as of social work.

Attitude Toward Human Behavior

Although in some quarters one still hears the statement that defects in character are the prime cause of poverty, it is more common to hear family social workers point out that poverty of character is not a general characteristic of the poor. An appreciation of the fact that complex social causes force many over the poverty line has replaced the comfortable and smug theory of "total depravity." The conception that poverty is a stigma is

[1] "Although in many cases," writes Joseph Lee, "poverty is not at the outset a disease of the character, yet under the unskillful, off-hand treatment of persons who believe in cure by miracle, in social rehabilitation through the universal application of a single nostrum or gold-cure, it will inevitably become so." Joseph Lee, "Charity and Democracy," *Charities and The Commons,* Vol. XVII, p. 391 (1907).

fast disappearing among the oncoming generation of workers.

That charity organization workers have a scientific, rather than moral, attitude toward their clients was early evidenced by the outlawing of the terms "worthy" and "unworthy" as applied to the poor. A dependent person, irrespective of the cause or causes of his dependency, needs treatment. The family case work, like the doctor, leaves to others the task of making moral judgments. It is his or her task to understand people and not to blame them. The attitude of many of the more thoughtful workers in the field is based on the belief that determinism is the correct explanation of human action. "All men are of necessity what they are, and cannot be otherwise; and they do of necessity what they do, and cannot act differently."[1] Family social workers are becoming increasingly objective in their study of the behavior problems of their clients. This does not mean that they are becoming less human, but more scientific. As a corollary they are often pragmatists in morals, believing in their evolution rather than that rules of conduct are fixed, unchangeable, absolute.

The Family as the Social Unit

One cannot fully appreciate the desire of charity organization workers to preserve an independent citizenship and to maintain family solidarity until one understands the significance which they attach to the family as a social institution. Such workers seldom concern themselves with historical speculations as to how the family arose or whether some other form of social arrangement would be better.[2] They, nevertheless, hold that "the modern

[1] Ray Madding McConnell, "Criminal Responsibility and Social Constraint," p. 338 (1912).

[2] This does not mean that there are not leaders in the movement who have presented the claims of the modern family for support and loyalty based on an historical analysis of its evolution in the past; e. g., Helen

family is in no sense a weakened or degenerate form." [1] They usually face the simple fact that if most people had to decide whether to give up their families or their other interests, they would cling to their families and try to develop new interests. In short, they accept as axiomatic the fact that nothing has that primary importance in determining a nation's strength and happiness that attaches to family life.

The high regard in which our oldest social institution is held is well illustrated by the following from the pen of one of the leaders of the movement in England, and which has been quoted approvingly on this side of the Atlantic.

"The pain of life is hallowed by it [the family], the drudgery sweetened, its pleasures consecrated. It is the great trysting-place of the generations, where past and future flash into the reality of the present. It is a great store-house in which the hardly earned treasures of the past, the inheritance of spirit and character from our ancestors, are guarded and preserved for our descendants. And it is the great discipline through which each generation learns anew the lesson of citizenship that no man can live for himself alone." [2]

It is not, therefore, surprising that charity organization workers believe as already stated, that the family may be "the means of restored independence and prosperity," [3] and that they constantly strive to strengthen the ties of family life and to avoid doing aught that would tend to weaken family responsibility and solidarity. It is no mere coincidence either that the movement should be referred to the "family rehabilitation movement," [4] that in choosing a new name many societies should select the title

Bosanquet, "The Family" (1906). See also Margaret F. Byington's article, "The Normal Family," *The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. LXXVII, pp. 13-28 (1918).

[1] Helen Bosanquet, "The Family," p. 336 (1906).

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 344.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 342.

[4] See Francis H. McLean, "Charity Societies," *The Survey,* Vol. XXXIV, p. 207 (1915).

"Family Welfare Society," and that the national organ of the movement should bear the title, "The Family."

An Appreciation

If one judges the charity organization movement by its fruits, it takes high rank among the various movements in the history of American philanthropy. It not only brought system into the charity of the generation that saw its beginnings, but it has ever since been the pioneer in evolving a technique of social case work. Although others have contributed to the methods of human adjustment, no one group has contributed more than a fraction of that contributed by the family social workers of the country.

In many communities the movement has enriched, either through personnel or by example, the local standards of child welfare work. To its inspiration medical social service owes its birth. The application of case work to public school children has been pushed furthest by those trained in its principles and methods. Even industry in the field of personnel work makes use of that standard book of family workers, Miss Richmond's "Social Diagnosis." The American Red Cross not only borrowed in the main the technique of the family welfare movement for its Home Service work, but made heavy inroads into its personnel.

Charity organization has spread not only from the Atlantic to the Pacific and the Lakes to the Gulf, but also from the large centers of population to some of the smallest. From a handful of communities in which an effort was made to systematize their efforts at dealing with the victims of poverty, the number of such communities now runs into the hundreds. The movement for social service exchanges and charities endorsement, though now largely independent, are both in the main outgrowths of the movement for organizing charity.

This means, as was pointed out in another connection over a score of years, that there have been embodied in the movement "aspirations that reappear in successive groups of earnest and devoted souls, needs that persist through successive victories over specific evils, methods that are flexible but permanently sound, ideas that are perennial, objects that humanity must attain, a spirit of charity that abideth forever." [1]

Through keeping case records and studying the causes of poverty, many local societies became interested in either organizing committees aiming to prevent poverty as anti-tuberculosis committees, housing committees, child labor committees, remedial loan committees, or encouraging others to organize for such work. Thus, as has been seen, the Buffalo Society, during over forty years of existence, has taken a leading part in organizing the social work of the community, being largely responsible for the growth of probation work and juvenile courts; tuberculosis work; wife desertion laws; chattel mortgage laws; tenement crusades; a model county lodging house; public playgrounds and baths, and a host of other things which lessen poverty. The New York Society, because of its location and broad-visioned leadership, early took no inconsiderable part nationally as well as locally in many of the preventive social movements. It was furthermore instrumental in conceiving, planning and carrying through the Pittsburgh Survey, and established and published until 1909 *Charities*, a weekly publication, the forerunner of *The Survey*, through which light has been shed on many industrial as well as social problems. These activities do not exhaust the list of community tasks undertaken by this society with the view to lessening poverty, nor are the two societies just mentioned, although prominent in the breadth of their interests in preventive

[1] Edward T. Devine, Report of the Committee on Organization of Charity, *Charities*, Vol. II, p. 3 (1899).

measures, altogether exceptional among their sister societies scattered throughout the country.

The charity organization movement from the beginning viewed itself as an educational movement. Not to monopolize charity, but to make it more intelligent, has been its aim. It is, therefore, not surprising that the oldest school for social work in America should be an integral activity of one of the pioneer societies of the country, nor that many of the other schools for professional training should be indebted to the local charity organization society if not for their birth, at least for very substantial assistance in both class room instruction and field work. The impetus to trained service in all lines of social work traceable to the charity organization movement is one of the important fruits by which it should be judged.

The Future

If the road of the critic is fraught with pitfalls, the road of the prophet is naught else. The task in this instance is made easier by the fact that certain tendencies now manifest are likely to continue for some time. When social work was largely an undifferentiated field, the local charity organization society inevitably loomed large on the horizon of social service. It often had to assume tasks other than its day's work because others were not yet ready to assume the burden. To some it seemed like a Maypole about which lesser "charities" should be content to dance. The day of specialization has arrived and seems destined to stay. Others will carry on the movements for public health, housing and recreation. The charity organization movement is becoming the family welfare movement in fact as well as in name. The emphasis on and development of standards in the technique of social case work characterizing the past decade and a half are likely to continue. In fact, the develop-

ment of the technique of social case work is gaining momentum as now one science and then another is made to yield a contribution for its enrichment; yesterday medicine, to-day psychology; to-morrow psychiatry.

This enriching of technique greatly increases the cost of all social case work. Although it is to be earnestly hoped that in the long run this higher quality of service will prove a real social economy, for the present it has meant that the budgets of family welfare agencies all over the country have been rising to unprecedented and almost, if not quite, unscaleable heights. It would seem that this will probably mean a further return to public outdoor relief as has been the case in the care of widows.

The increasing cost seems destined also to force charity organization societies to restrict increasingly their activities to the education of both public official and citizen in higher standards of meeting human need. By some who have been most identified with the movement, this is held ever to have been its only function. A limited income means limiting intake if a high quality of work is to be achieved and standards advanced. Thus a family social agency, instead of monopolizing all the family case work needed to be done in a given community, will become increasingly in the future the standard-bearer of good work, the light on the hill by which public official, lay citizen or social agency touching the lives of the poor may judge the quality of the work undertaken.

The development of the technique of social case work has gained impetus from the growing belief in the universal application of its methods. That its principles and methods were first worked out for a special disadvantaged group is analogous to the development of principles and methods in other fields of human interest. The principles and methods of manual training were first worked out consistently for the negro. The educational practices associated with the name of Madame Montessori were first worked out with the feeble-minded. So the

principles of social case work first worked out with those below the poverty line are now seen to apply equally to those above the line of economic dependence. Those below constitute no more a class than those above. There is no descriptive phrase which one can apply to the former with any assurance that it would adequately describe them or differentiate them in any fundamental sense from humanity at large. In any group there always are found individual differences. Whether they are due to heredity, environment or both, need not concern us here. That they exist is, however, of vital concern to all who would achieve the greatest results in working with individuals, be that work reformational or educational.

It is seldom that a person who is seriously out of adjustment with society can make the adjustment without such individual consideration. Case work, with its individualization of treatment, is thus an inevitable part of all effective work with socially unadjusted individuals or families. It is not founded on opinion or caprice, but based on the laws of psychology and of social organization which are gaining increasing recognition in other fields of human endeavor.

The last twenty-five years has seen a remarkable advance in medical knowledge. Science has learned, for example, the cause of tuberculosis, and is to-day especially concerned in perfecting its cure. To popularize this new medical knowledge and to make it effective is one of the crying needs of the time. It matters little how far advanced pure science may be, if this knowledge is not in such form as to be effectively applied, to the *individual.* A man may get the best kind of instructions at a tuberculosis dispensary, but it avails little if these instructions are not properly carried out, as in too many cases they are not, often through the lack of understanding of instructions, or the lack of money to carry them out. Social work in the form of a visiting nurse or other expert of the social service department of some hospital must

individualize each case in applying scientific knowledge to effect a cure.

In the realm of education we are now learning that much advance can be made by individualization of treatment. Costly school equipments have been erected throughout the length and breadth of the land. Children are waiting by the millions to be educated. There is much waste at the present time in the returns which society is getting from its investment. It is not enough that there are the children to be educated on the one hand and a costly and advanced school system on the other. That school system is a failure which does not reach the individual child. Much of the effectiveness of the present school machinery is destroyed by bad home conditions, such as overcrowding, improper food or a lack of appreciation on the part of parents of the work of the school. These conditions often result in irregular attendance, a falling behind in the grades and an early dropping out of school in favor of the factory. Social case work will not have done its full service to the community until through a system of visiting teachers it follows up the work of the school into the home and so makes it truly effective. Such work must in the nature of the case deal with the individual.

It is, in short, the universality of the principles and methods of social case work that interests some of the most conscientious workers in the charity organization movement as much as helping the poor out of their poverty, even though that contribution when done constructively may be of incalculable value.

An interesting corollary of the wider applications of social case work may be the development of a pay service for those who can afford it and who need help in solving some of their personal problems of adjustment. Such a practitioner must be not only versed in the principles of applied psychology, but also know enough of the principles of medicine and psychiatry to utilize spe-

cialists in these fields whenever needed. Pay clinics, aptly described as "a step toward democratic medical service," [1] have arrived. Is it too much to expect that pay service in the field of social case work is about to become a reality?

It may well be that the charity organization movement, like earlier movements in philanthropy, may go, but social case work in its broader applications seems destined to go on forever. Since eternal change is the order of nature, there can be no final solutions for social ills. A society founded on socialism, single tax or anarchy would, in time, doubtless need its charity organization society or its counterpart. As civilization evolves it brings ever new problems, and demands ever more complex adjustments of the individuals who compose the body politic. In the onward march of progress there will always be some who find the new adjustments demanded more difficult than others. As long as society is dynamic, social institutions will fail to function properly, and some will tend to drop back or even out of the procession. Such maladjustments are some of the "costs of progress." Three alternatives are possible: ruthless elimination; a slowing of the rate of progress to fit the pace of the slowest; or the stronger and more able helping those who tend to lag behind, to make an adjustment which would otherwise be impossible. The need for individual adjustment, which is the heart of the case work of the charity organization worker, thus seems to be written in the nature of progress itself.

The spirit of charity was born and fostered of that "struggle for the lives of others," as Henry Drummond terms it, which has been the basis of social solidarity in all the stages of social evolution, whether the unit be the family, the clan, the village community or the modern state. This charity, which is an obligation imposed on

[1] Michael M. Davis, and Andrew R. Warner, "Pay Clinics," *The Survey*, Vol. XL, pp. 334-336 (1918).

all in the name of a common humanity, to help those who need help, still has the same function in modern society and will doubtless continue to have, that it has had in all the ages of man's past evolution.[1]

Will an age whose watchword has become Prevention continue to need family case work, except for the individual who falls behind in the procession called social progress? History and current experience answer in the affirmative. Repeatedly the experience gained in the service of the few has revealed the needs of the many. Such has been the origin of the great preventive movements of housing, public health and recreation. Those who are engaged in the relief of distress, unless they are mere automata, are inevitably led to the consideration of preventive measures. In brief, social case work reveals the social conditions which call for community action.

This method of working from the small to the large, from the individual to the general, has the value of riveting down the new preventive measures which might otherwise be so far removed from reality as to add to the number of paper programs that are aborted each generation. The first-hand knowledge of those who have worked beside the victims of bad social conditions is of immense value, for as Miss Van Kleeck has well pointed out, "the social reformer who does not draw his conclusions from the actual experience of individuals is in danger of being an unsafe guide in social action." [2]

Although we cannot abolish poverty by individual case work, case work is the means by which we look before we leap, if we would see our way clearly in attacking scientifically this ancient, but no longer necessary, evil. An analysis of the thousands of cases coming before a charity organization society reveals the economic and social forces operating in a given community to create poverty.

[1] See Charles A. Ellwood, "The Functions of Charity in Modern Society," *Charities and The Commons*, Vol. XIX, pp. 1348-1353 (1908).
[2] Mary Van Kleeck, "Case Work and Social Reform," *The Annals*, Vol. LXXVII, p. 9, (1918).

Good case work, "if recorded, will add to human knowledge and echo to the end of time." [1] Its first-hand knowledge of social and industrial conditions and of the action and reaction of environment and heredity affords a valuable fund of information for scientific research.[2] Social case work, when well done, is, therefore, not only constructive, but preventive as well, both for the individual and for society.

The enthusiasm of many a charity organization worker is found in the belief that a great opportunity lies before those who take the data of "the day's work" to bring forward "a program of radical social action and social legislation that shall tend to develop in every citizen in our community the spiritual force and vitality that is in him and shall not at the same time deprive him of a fraction of such force by taking from him the need upon which to so large an extent its exercise, its very existence, depends." [3] It is the broadly trained and large-visioned social case workers who have the experience at hand out of which a radical constructive social program ought to grow and upon which such a program must be based if it is to be sound and effective for its purpose. And such is the unity of social work that it is safe to say that the charity organization worker who has not an outlook beyond the individual person or family with whom he is dealing, and who does not translate his cases into social problems and so make case work count in their solution, will scarcely be the most successful in his services to the individual he or she serves or to society at large.

It may be that this age has made as much progress in the realm of social theory as possible, and that what is now needed is for some of our best minds to go into the field to gather new material for the next thought

[1] Edna G. Henry, "The Sick," *The Annals,* Vol. LXXVII, p. 59 (1918).

[2] See Edward T. Devine, "Misery and Its Causes" (1909), a study of families who were known to the New York Charity Organization Society.

[3] Joseph Lee, "Charity and Democracy," *Charity and The Commons,* Vol. XVII, p. 394 (1907).

development. Certainly initiative and fresh ideas come from actual personal contact with the active work of the world, in tenement, court room, reformatory, factory, playground, schoolroom, hospital, and clinic.

Besides providing a method for the effective treatment of individuals and of revealing the social conditions which call for community action, social case work has the further value of being actually the first steps in prevention itself. In winning for the present generation of consumptives, for instance, the kindest and most adequate care, we are cutting out many centers of contagion and at the same time educating the public as to the true means of prevention. Every case in which feeble-mindedness is a controlling factor that is adequately handled means that the potential procreation of similar feeble-minded never becomes a reality, and the first step of a movement toward the prevention of feeble-mindedness has been taken.

In a broader sense cure has often been the forerunner of prevention by showing the concrete step necessary to accomplish this end. "In the office of the country practitioner, in the crowded wards of city hospitals, and on the field of battle," writes Miss Richmond, "medicine has sought and found, while pushing hard toward cure, the blessed means of prevention. This has been the method of modern medicine and it may well be in the future the method of modern charity." [1] The large problem can only be understood and attacked when it has been mastered in detail in the individual case.

Case work, furthermore, aids social reform in providing a test of the value of legislative and non-legislative mass measures for social welfare in revealing their effect upon the individuals whose condition of life and work such measures reach. It may corroborate and confirm the ideas or basis on which such measures rest, or it may demonstrate that such ideas need supplementary meas-

[1] Mary E. Richmond, "The Good Neighbor," pp. 17 and 18 (1908).

ures, or may be even erroneous and impractical. Thus, for example, child labor reform is not accomplished when its champions have succeeded in placing laws on the statute books. If the enforcement of the law works hardship in individual instances, laxness is likely to creep into the enforcement of the law and gradually result in bringing the whole law into disrepute. To prevent this case work with scholarships for certain needy children is often required. It is usually those who, having a passion for facts, see all that is involved in such a situation and save the law from becoming a dead letter. Whose opinion, moreover should be more valuable on the success or failure of a given piece of legislation in the field of mothers' pensions, child labor, compulsory school attendance and workmen's compensation than those whose daily routine brings them into close and intimate contact with the many affected for weal or for woe by such measures?

Furthermore, the experience gained in the service of the few will help not only to determine the needs of the many and the needs of supplementary measures, but it will "ascertain the probable reaction of the greater number to general preventive and curative efforts." [1]

The *sine qua non* of all effective social legislation is intelligent public opinion. The education of the public in the realm of social reform depends upon effective propaganda. Who can bear truer witness to the persistent spread of tuberculosis and its close connection with poverty than the charity organization worker and the district visiting nurse? To the waste of human and economic resources through infant mortality? To the increase of mental defectiveness? Who sooner than the family social worker finds the father of a family a spent toiler at fifty? Who realizes more keenly the number of deserting fathers? Human suffering in the concrete usually calls forth the most untiring efforts for bringing about greater social

[1] Mary Willcox Glenn, "Case Work," *The Survey*, Vol. XXIX, p. 430 (1913).

justice which, in the last analysis, is but a phrase to cover a number of concrete reforms in the social structure, each of which must be worked out by definite steps.[1] Who will make greater efforts to bring social justice than those who have tried to help the victims of injustice? With a sense of reality they are more likely to be the ones to bring about the better day, while their critics still continue to criticize. For this educational work the charity organization society, with a large force of volunteers, is exceptionally well equipped.

It has been the charity organization society with its records of flesh and blood supplying abundant illustrations with which to reinforce cold arguments in behalf of measures of prevention that has brought about a social awakening in many communities. Such efforts have often led communities "to deal, not by some magical formula, not by some golden panacea, not once for all, as some mistakenly think, but to deal, nevertheless, radically and intelligently with specific social evils, one after another, and to deal with them not merely in their symptoms, but in their complicated ramifications and with their ultimate causes." [2] Thus the charity organization movement modestly, starting as an agency to systematize the giving of relief, by the very nature of its intensive work with dependent families has become a mighty force as an interpreter of social conditions, and a creator of sound public opinion in matters of social reform.

The dominant note of the charity organization movement is not sounded nor the dynamic force of the movement understood until one appreciates why charity organization workers exclaim in response to the slogan, "Not charity, but justice," that "while the appeal to justice is good, it is not enough." "Not theology only, but social economy makes Portia's confession that in the

[1] See Frank Tucker, "Social Justice." Presidential Address at the fortieth meeting of the National Conference of Charities and Correction (1913).

[2] Edward T. Devine, Unpublished Address.

course of justice none of us should see salvation. The total annihilation of injustice might leave us bankrupt of progress, prosperity and good will. The appeal of the future as of all the past is for a genuine philanthropy of which justice is a part, for a passionate concern that our neighbors shall have from us not just dealing only, but the electric touch of human sympathy and understanding, the partnership of man with man which keeps us above the brutes and below the gods on the more congenial levels of our common humanity! [1] The same leader in the movement wrote elsewhere in similar vein. "Spiritual benefits, social courtesies, personal consideration expressed in a thousand ingenious ways, will operate as charity, calling forth devout benedictions, long after all need for alms has forever disappeared. Instead of ceasing to ask for and to accept what we have not earned, as we become more independent and more interdependent, we shall accept freely and with glowing hearts vastly more that we have not earned than now, concerning ourselves but little as to our earnings, but rejoicing in the privilege of giving freely to others, with even less concern as to their earnings." [2] "Justice says do not destroy life; charity says save life." [3] It is in this sense that another leader of the movement gives as the best definition of charity organization—"love with judgment"—and in reply to the query, "why need we organize so sweet a thing as charity," says, "we organize music which would otherwise be discord. We organize religion. Without organization, charity would be, to a large extent, waste and error." [4]

[1] Edward T. Devine, "Philanthropy and Business," *The Survey,* Vol. XXXII, p. 265 (1914).

[2] Edward T. Devine, "A Mediæval Efficiency Test," *The Survey,* Vol. XXXI, p. 597 (1914).

[3] Felix Adler quoted by Mary Willcox Glenn. Presidential Address Forty-second National Conference of Charities and Correction (1915).

[4] Frederic Almy, Annual Report, Buffalo Charity Organization Society (1915).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBOTT, EDITH, "Education for Social Work," Washington, Government, 1915, pp. 15. Reprint from Report of the Commissioner of Education, (1915), Vol. I, Chap. XIII.

ABBOTT, EVELYN, and CAMPBELL, LEWIS, "The Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett," London, J. Murray, 1897, pp. viii, 499.

ADAMS, HERBERT BAXTER, ed., "Notes on the Literature of Charities," Johns Hopkins University Studies, Series 5, no. 8, 1887, pp. 48.

ADDAMS, JANE, "The Subtle Problems of Charity," *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. LXXXIII (1899), pp. 163-178.

ADDAMS, JANE and others, "Philanthropy and Social Progress," Seven Essays by Miss Jane Addams, Robert A. Woods, Father J. O. S. Huntington, Professor Franklin H. Giddings, and Bernard Bosanquet, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1893, pp. xi, 268.

ALLEN, WILLIAM H., "Modern Philanthropy, a Study of Efficient Appealing and Giving," New York, Dodd, Mead and Co., 1912, p. x, 437.

ALMY, FREDERIC, "Relief, a Primer," reprinted by The Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1910, pp. 34.

American Association for Organizing Charity, "Financial Federations, the report of a special committee," New York City, American Association for Organizing Charity, 1917, pp. 285.

ANONYMOUS, "The Charity Organization Society," *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 206 (1907), pp. 55-76.

BAKER, JAMES, "The Life of Sir Thomas Bernard," London, John Murray, 1819, pp. 190.

BALDWIN, WILLIAM H., "Family Desertion and Non-Support Laws," a study of the laws of the various states made in connection with the Associated Charities, Washington, D. C., Washington, D. C., 1904, pp. 136.

BLISS, W. D. P., ed., "The New Encyclopedia of Social Reform," New York, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1908, Article on "Charity Organization Societies or Associated Charities,"

revised by E. T. Devine, pp. 158, 159; Article on "Poverty," pp. 933-941.

BICKNELL, E. P., "Problems of Philanthropy in Chicago, 1903," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. XXI (May, 1903), pp. 37–46.

BOGEN, BORIS D., "Jewish Philanthropy: Methods of Jewish Social Service in the United States," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1907, pp. 391.

BOSANQUET, BERNARD, "Principles and Chief Dangers of the Administration of Charities," in "Philanthropy and Social Progress," Seven Essays by Jane Addams and others, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1893, pp. 249–268.

BOSANQUET, HELEN, "The Family," London, The Macmillan Co., 1906, pp. vi, 344.

———, "Social Work in London, 1869–1912; a History of the Charity Organization Society," London; John Murray, 1914, pp. 420.

———, "Standard of Life and Other Studies," London; The Macmillan Co., 1898, pp. vi, 219.

BOUGAND, LOUIS VICTOR EMILE, "History of St. Vincent de Paul, founder of the Congregation of the Mission (Vincentians) and of the Sisters of Charity," translated from the second French edition by the Rev. J. Brady, with an introduction by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1908, pp. xvi, 416.

BRACKETT, JEFFREY R., "Supervision and Education in Charity," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1903, pp. v, 222.

BRANDT, LILIAN, "The Causes of Poverty," *Political Science Quarterly,* Vol. XXIII (1908), pp. 637–651.

———, "Five Hundred and Seventy-four Deserters and Their Families," Charity Organization Society, New York City, 1905, pp. 64.

———, "The Charity Organization Society of the City of New York, 1882–1907. History: Account of Present Activities." Twenty-fifth Annual Report for the Year Ending September Thirtieth, Nineteen Hundred and Seven, The Charity Organization Society of the City of New York, 1907, pp. 318.

BROWN, MARY WILCOX, "Development of Thrift," New York: The Macmillan Co., 1899, pp. x, 222.

BRUERE, ROBERT W., "The Good Samaritan Incorporated," *Harper's Monthly Magazine,* Vol. CXX (1910), pp. 833-838.

BYINGTON, MARGARET F., "The Confidential Exchange: a form

of social co-operation," The Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, 1912, pp. 30.

———, "What Social Workers Should Know about Their Own Communities," New York, Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, first edition, 1911, pp. 32; second edition, 1912, pp. 42; third edition, completely revised, 1917, pp. 45.

CABOT, RICHARD C., "Social Service and the Art of Healing," New York, Moffat, Yard and Co., 1909, pp. ix, 192.

CANNON, IDA M., "Social Work in Hospitals; a contribution to progressive medicine," New York, Survey Associates, Inc., 1913, pp. xii, 257.

CARVER, THOMAS NIXON, "Essays in Social Justice," Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1915, pp. 429.

CHALMERS, THOMAS, "On the Sufficiency of the Parochial System without a Poor-Rate, for the right management of the poor," Glasgow, W. Collins, 1841, pp. viii, 336.

———, "The Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns," Glasgow, Starke, 1821–1826, 3 vols.

CHAPIN, ROBERT COIT, "The Standard of Living among Workingmen's Families in New York City," New York, Charities Publication Committee, 1909, pp. xv, 372.

Charities; the official organ of the Charity Organization Society of the city of New York, New York, 1897–1905 (from 1905 to 1909, *Charities and The Commons,* from 1909 to date, *The Survey*). Since 1912 published by the Survey Associates, Inc.

Charities and The Commons, a weekly review of local and general philanthropy, published by the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York, New York, 1905–1909.

The Charities Review, a journal of practical sociology, Vol. I (1891) to Vol. X (1901).

The Charity Organization Review, published by the London Charity Organization Society, London, 1891 to date.

"Charity Organization," Bibliographical Pamphlet, Bulletin no. 9, New York, The Russell Sage Library, February, 1915.

"Child Welfare," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. XCVIII, The American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, 1921, pp. ix, 222.

CHRYSOSTOM, ST. JOHN, 347-407 A.D., "Sermon on Alms, delivered at Antioch after passing through the market-place in the winter-time, and seeing the paupers and beggars lying there neglected"; Studies in Social Work, No. 10, The New York School of Philanthropy, 1917, pp. 24.

CLOSSON, C. C., JR., "Unemployed in American Cities," *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* Vol. VIII (1894), pp. 168–217, 453-477.

COLCORD, JOANNA C., "Broken Homes," New York, The Russell Sage Foundation, 1919, pp. 208.

CONYNGTON, MARY, "Manual of Practical Charity; how to help; designed for the use of non-professional workers among the poor," New York, Ronald Press, 1906, pp. x, 371.

CROOKER, JOSEPH HENRY, "Problems in American Society; some social studies," Boston, G. H. Ellis, 1889, pp. 293.

DAVIS, PHILIP, editor, "The Field of Social Service," Boston, Small, Maynard and Co., 1915, pp. 436.

DEACON, J. BYRON, "Disasters," New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1918, pp. 230.

DEGERANDO, MARIE JOSEPH, Baron, "Visitor of the Poor," translated from the French, with an introduction by Joseph Tuckerman, Boston, Hilliard, 1832, pp. xxxii, 211.

DEVINE, E. T., "Efficiency and Relief, a program of social work," New York, Columbia University Press, 1906, pp. vii, 45.

———, "The Essentials of a Relief Policy," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. XXI (1903), pp. 1–20.

———, "Misery and Its Causes," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1909, pp. 274.

———, "The Practice of Charity: Individual, Associated and Organized," New York, Lentilhon and Co., 1901, pp. x, 186.

——— "Organized Charity and Industry, a Chapter from the History of the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York," Studies in Social Work, Number 2, The New York School of Philanthropy, 1915, pp. 16.

———, "The Principles of Relief," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1904, pp. xi, 495.

———, "Social Ideals Implied in Present American Programs of Voluntary Philanthropy," *Publications of American Sociological Society,* Vol. VII (1912), pp. 177–188.

———, "The New View of Charity," *Atlantic Monthly,* Vol. 102 (1908), pp. 737–744.

DUNCAN, JOHN, "Collections Relative to Systematic Relief of the Poor, at different periods and in different countries; with observations on charity, its proper objects and conduct, and its influence on the welfare of nations": London, Richard Cruttwell, 1815, pp. 220.

ELLIS, GEORGE EDWARD, "Memoir of Sir Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford," with notices of his daughter; published

in connection with an edition of Rumford's complete works, by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Boston, 1871, pp. xvi, 680.

"Emergency Relief, a Selected Bibliography," Bulletin of the Russell Sage Foundation Library, No. 8, 1914.

EMMINGHAUS, A., editor, "Poor Relief in Different Parts of Europe," being a selection of Essays translated from the German work "Das armenwesen und die Armengesetzgebung in Europaischen Staaten," revised by E. B. Eastwick, London, Edward Stanford, 1873, pp. xi, 314.

"Encyclopedia Brittanica," 11th edition, Article on "Charity and Charities," Vol. V, pp. 860–891, by C. S. Loch.

The Family, New York City, published by the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, Vol. I, no. 1, 1920 to date.

FAWCETT, HENRY, "Pauperism: Its Causes and Remedies," London and New York, The Macmillan Co., 1871, pp. viii, 270.

FEINBERG, LOUIS, translator, The Section on "Charity from the Schulhan Arukh, an exposition of the rabbinical teachings governing the charity of the Jews in the Middle Ages." Studies in Social Work, No. 6, The New York School of Philanthropy, pp. 32.

FOWLE, THOMAS WELBANK, "Poor Law," London, The Macmillan Co., 1893, pp. 175.

GRAY, B. KIRKMAN, "A History of English Philanthropy from the Dissolution of the Monasteries to the Taking of the First Census," London, P. S. King and Son, 1905, pp. xi, 302.

GREEN, JOHN RICHARD, "Letters of John Richard Green," edited by Leslie Stephens, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1901, pp. xi, 512.

GURTEEN, S. HUMPHREYS, "Handbook of Charity," Buffalo, N. Y., Gurteen, 1882, pp. iv, 254.

———, "Phases of Charity, 1st edition, Buffalo, Haas, Nauert and Klein; second edition, New York, A. D. F. Randolph and Co. (1877?), pp. 79.

HALBERT, L. A., "Effective Charity Administration," *Annals American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. XLI, pp. 176–192 (1912).

HALE, GEORGE SILSBEE, "The Charities of Boston," Chapter in Memorial History of Boston, edited by Justin Winsor, Boston, Osgood, 1881, pp. 641–674.

HAMMOND, L. H., "In Black and White; an interpretation of southern life," New York, Revell Co., 1914, pp. 244.

HARRIS, ELLA, "Charity Functions of the Pennsylvania County," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. XLVII (1913), pp. 166-181.

HARTLEY, ISAAC SMITHSON, editor, "Memorial of Robert Milham Hartley," Utica, N. Y., printed, not published, 1882, pp. xv, 549.

HENDERSON, CHARLES R., "Introduction to the Study of the Dependent, Defective and Delinquent Classes and of Their Social Treatment," Boston, Heath, 1901, second edition enlarged, pp. viii, 397.

———, "Modern Methods of Charity, an account of the systems of relief, public and private, in the principal countries having modern methods," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1904, pp. xiv, 715.

———, "World Currents in Charity Theory and Practice," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. XXI (1903), pp. 363–387.

HERRICK, M. T., "Panic of 1907 and Some of Its Lessons," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. XXXI, (1908), pp. 308–325.

HILL, OCTAVIA, "Homes of the London Poor," reprinted from the *Fortnightly Review* and *Macmillan's Magazine* as publication no. 8 of the State Charities Aid Association of New York, 1875, pp. 78.

———, "Life of Octavia Hill as Told in Her Letters"; edited by C. E. Maurice, London, The Macmillan Co., 1913, pp. xi, 591.

HOLLANDER, JACOB H., "The Abolition of Poverty," New York, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1914, pp. 122.

HUBBARD, C. M., "Relation of Charity Organization Societies to Relief Societies and Relief-Giving," *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. VI (1901), pp. 783–789.

HUNTER, ROBERT, "The Relation between Social Settlements and Charity Organization," *Journal of Political Economy,* Vol. XI (1902), pp. 75–88.

HUNTINGTON, FATHER J. O. S., "Philanthropy: Its Success and Failure," see "Philanthropy and Social Progress," Seven Essays by Jane Addams and others, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1893, pp. xi, 268.

Indianapolis, Commercial Club Relief Committee, "Relief for the Unemployed in Indianapolis, Report of the Commercial Club Relief Committee and Its Auxiliary, the Citizens' Finance Committee," 1893–94, Indianapolis, The Commercial Club, 1894, pp. 68.

"Instructions for Forming Conferences," Society of St. Vin-

cent de Paul, Superior Council of New York, New York, 1911, pp. 8.

International Congress of Charities, Correction and Philanthropy, 6th section, "The Organization and Affiliation of Charity in Countries, States, Cities, Towns and Villages, and Preventive Work among the Poor," Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1894, pp. xxxii, 399.

Jersey, M. E., "Charity a Hundred Years Ago," *The Nineteenth Century,* Vol. LVII (1905), pp. 655–670.

Johnson, Alexander, "On Being a Director," an open letter to one of the Board of a Society for Organizing Charity, Charity Organization Department, Russell Sage Foundation, N. Y., 1910.

———, "Concerning Certain Wise Limits to Charity Organization Society Work," *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. V (1899), pp. 322–328.

Kellogg, Charles D., "History of Charity Organization in the United States," Report of Committee on Charity Organization, Proceedings, The National Conference of Charities and Correction, 20th annual session, pp. 52-93 (1893).

Kellogg, D. O., "On Organization of Charity in Philadelphia," *The Penn Monthly,* Vol. IX (1878), pp. 707–723.

Lalleman, Leon, "Historie de la Charite," 4 vols., Paris, Picard, 1902-1910.

Lee, Joseph, "Constructive and Preventive Philanthropy," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1902, pp. x, 242.

Lee, Porter R., "Social Work with Families and Individuals," Pamphlet No. 1, Studies in Social Work, The New York School of Philanthropy.

———, "Treatment: Methods Employed by Organized Charity in the Rehabilitation of Families," pamphlet published by The Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1910, pp. 16.

Leighton, Sir Baldwyn, ed., "Letters and Other Writings of Edward Denison," London, Richard Bentley, 1872, second edition, pp. xv, 257.

Lend-a-Hand, a record of progress. Vol. I (1886) to Vol. XVIII (1897), Boston, J. Stilman Smith and Co. No more was published.

Loch, C. S., "Charity Organization," London, Sonnenschein, 1892, pp. iv, 106.

———, "Charity and Social Life; a short study of religious and social thought in relation to charitable methods and institutions." London, The Macmillan Co., 1910, pp. xii, 496.

———, editor, "Methods of Social Advance," short studies in social practice by various authors, London, The Macmillan Co., 1904, pp. 192.

Lowell, Josephine Shaw, "Public Relief and Private Charity," New York, Putnam, 1884, pp. 111.

———, "The True Aim of Charity Organization Societies," *The Forum,* Vol. XXI (1896), pp. 494–500.

"Manual of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul," Paris, 1909.

McClenahan, Bessie A., "The Iowa Plan for the Combination of Public and Private Relief," University of Iowa Monographs, Studies in Social Sciences, Vol. V, no. 3, Iowa City, The University, 1918, pp. 73.

McLean, Francis H., "The Central Council of Social Agencies," a manual. American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, New York, 1920, pp. 47.

———, "The Formation of Charity Organization Societies in Smaller Cities," new edition revised and enlarged, New York, The Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, 1910, pp. 51.

———, "On Making Our Societies Democratic," *The Family,* Vol. I (1920), p. 9.

Marsh, Benjamin C., "Causes of Vagrancy and Methods of Eradication," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. XXIII (1904), pp. 445–456.

Masterman, N., editor, "Chalmers on Charity"; a selection of passages and scenes to illustrate the social teaching and practical work of Thomas Chalmers, D.D., London, Archibald Constable and Co., 1900, pp. xxii, 414.

Maurice, C. C., editor, "Life of Octavia Hill, as told in her letters," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1913, pp. 591.

The Monthly Register of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicancy, Vol. I, (1879) to Vol. XXI (1900), Philadelphia.

Muirhead, John H., "The Starting-Point of Poor Law Reform, being articles upon the principles in common and at issue in the reports of the Poor Law Commissioners, with a plea for Agreement as to First Steps," London, P. S. King and Son, 1910, pp. vi, 102.

National Conference Charities and Correction, Proceedings, 1st annual session, 1874 to date; 1917, became the National Conference of Social Work.

Nesbitt, Florence, "Household Management," New York, The Russell Sage Foundation, 1918, pp. 170.

O'Connor, C. J., and others, "San Francisco Relief Survey;

the organization and methods of relief used after the earthquake and fire of April 18, 1906," New York, Survey Associates, Inc., 1913, pp. xxv, 483.

O'Meara, Kathleen, "Frederic Ozanam, Professor at the Sorbonne; his life and works," 1st American edition, New York, The Catholic Publication Society Co., 1878, pp. xii, 345.

Paine, Robert Treat, Jr., "The Work of Volunteer Visitors of the Associated Charities among the Poor," *Journal of Social Science*, No. XII, 1880, pp. 101–116.

Parmelee, Maurice, "Poverty and Social Progress," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1916, pp. xv, 477.

Patten, S. N., "The New Basis of Civilization," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1907, pp. vii, 220.

"Problems in Charity and Correction," Special Bulletin of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, May, 1903.

Proceedings, National Conference of Social Work, (See *National Conference of Charities and Correction*).

Publications of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, New York City.

Report of Committee on Home Economics, New York Charity Organization Society, "Budget Planning in Social Case Work," Bulletin no. 3, 1919, pp. 31.

"Report of the Superior Council of New Orleans to the Council-General in Paris, for the year 1914," Society of St. Vincent de Paul, 1915, pp. 46.

"Report of the Superior Council of New York to the Council-General in Paris, 1914," Society of St. Vincent de Paul, 1915, pp. 90.

"Reports on the Elberfeld Poor Law System and German Workmen's Colonies," presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty, March, 1888, London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, pp. 137 (pp. 51-95, "Report on the Elberfeld System and the Organization of Charity in Germany," by C. S. Loch).

Richmond, Mary E., "Friendly Visiting Among the Poor: A Handbook for Charity Workers," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1914, pp. viii, 225.

———, "The Good Neighbor in the Modern City," Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Co., 1908, pp. ix, 159.

———, "Social Diagnosis," New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1917, pp. 511.

——— and Hall, F. S., "Study of Nine Hundred and Eighty-five Widows Known to Certain Charity Organization So-

cieties in 1910, New York Russell Sage Foundation, Charity Organization Dept., 1913, pp. 83.

———, "The Retail Method in Reform," *International Journal of Ethics*, Vol. XVI (1906), pp. 171-179.

———, "What Is Social Case Work?" New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1922, pp. 268.

RIIS, JACOB A., "A Modern St. George," *Scribners' Magazine*, Vol. L (1911), pp. 385-402.

ROSS, E. A., "Philanthropy with Strings," *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 114 (1914), pp. 289-294.

SANDERS, E. K., "Vincent de Paul, priest and philanthropist, 1576-1660," New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1913, pp. 419.

SAYLES, MARY BUELL, "Home Service in Action; A study of Case Work in the Home Service Section of the New York and Bronx County Chapters of the American Red Cross," New York, N. Y. County Chapter, American Red Cross, 1921, pp. 232.

SEARS, AMELIA, "The Charity Visitor, A Handbook for Beginners," Chicago, School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1913, pp. 76.

"Second Annual Report, Municipal Charities Commission," City of Los Angeles, California, 1914-1915, pp. 106.

SENIOR, NASSAU WILLIAM, "Statement of the Provision for the Poor and of the Condition of the Labouring Classes in a Considerable Portion of America and Europe," London, B. Fellowes, 1835.

SHALER, NATHANIEL S., "The Neighbor; the natural history of human contacts," Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1904, pp. vii, 342.

SHEFFIELD, ADA ELIOT, "Social Case History, Its Construction and Content," New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1920, "Social Work Series," pp. 227.

SLOSSON, EDWIN E., "Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford," in "Leading Men of Science." Edited by David Starr Jordan, N. Y., Henry Holt, 1910, pp. 9-50.

SMITH, SAMUEL GEORGE, "Social Pathology," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1911, pp. viii, 380.

"Social Work with Families," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. LXXVII, Philadelphia, The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1918, pp. ix, 198.

SOLENBERGER, ALICE WILLIARD, "One Thousand Homeless Men," New York, Charities Publication Committee, 1911, pp. xxiv, 374.

STEWART, WILLIAM RHINELANDER, "The Philanthropic Work of Josephine Shaw Lowell," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1911, pp. 584.

SUMNER, WM. GRAHAM, "What Social Classes Owe to Each Other," New York and London, Harper and Bros., 1883, pp. 169.

The Survey, a journal of social, civic and industrial welfare and the public health, New York, Charities Publication Committee, 1909—date. Survey Associates, Inc., since 1912.

TOYNBEE, ARNOLD, "Toynbee Lectures on the Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century in England," London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1915, pp. 317.

TUCKERMAN, JOSEPH, "An Essay on the Wages Paid to Females for Their Labor," Philadelphia, Griggs and Dickinson, 1830, pp. 58.

———, "On the Elevation of the Poor," edited by Edward Everett Hale, Boston, Roberts Bros., 1874, pp. 206.

UFFORD, WALTER S., "Fresh Air Charity in the United States," Bonnell, Silver and Co., 1897, pp. iii, 114.

UHLHORN, JOHANN GERHARD WILHELM, "Christian Charity in the Ancient Church," translated from the German, New York, Scribners, 1883, pp. vi, 424.

"United States Bureau of Labor Statistics," No. 195, July, 1916, p. 115.

WALLERSTEIN, HELEN C., "The Functional Relations of Fifteen Case Working Agencies" (as shown by a study of 421 individual families) and "The Report of the Philadelphia Intake Committee," Bureau for Social Research, Seybert Institution, Philadelphia, 1919, pp. x, 176.

WARNER, AMOS G., "American Charities: A Study in Philanthropy and Economics," first edition, New York, Crowell, 1894, pp. viii, 430; revised edition, 1908, pp. xxii, 510; third edition, 1919, pp. xxii, 541.

WEBB, SIDNEY and BEATRICE, "The Prevention of Destitution," London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1911, pp. vi, 348.

WINES, F. H., "Sociology and Philanthropy," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. XII, 1898, pp. 49-57.

WINTER, ALICE AMES, editor, "Charles Gordon Ames: A Spiritual Autobiography," Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1913, pp. 229.

Year-Books of the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, formerly the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity, 1912—date.

YU-YUE TSU, "The Spirit of Chinese Philanthropy," New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1912, pp. 122.

INDEX

Adams, Herbert B., 307 fn.
Addams, Jane, 305, 508.
Adequate relief, 411-414.
  as a test of efficiency, 451, 452.
  causes for increase in amount of, 413.
Alcoholism, prevention of, 373, 374.
Almy, Frederic, 116 fn., 445 fn.
American Association for Community Organization, 435, 436.
American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, 344-346, 362, 399, 408, 419, 439.
  Council of Charity Officers—a forerunner of, 238, 239.
  requirements for eligibility to membership, 345, 346.
American Association of Social Service Exchanges, 410.
American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity, 319, 346 fn., 361, 363, 393, 438, 439.
  see also American Association for Organizing Family Social Work.
American Red Cross, 437-439.
  institutional membership in, 377-379.
Ames, Charles Gordon, 175, 188 fn.
Ames, Fanny B., 407.
Annual reports, 488, 489.
  criticism of, 515.
Antecedents of the movement, foreign, see Foreign antecedents of the movement.
Antecedents of the movement in the United States, 64-93.
Arnold, Dr. Thomas, 56.
Associations for improving the condition of the poor, nation-wide movement for the establishment of, 76-88.
  causes of failure of, 88-93, 224.

Bailly, Sylvain, 38-44, 59.
Baron De Gerando, 71.
Begging, attitude of charity organization societies toward, 310-319.
Beginnings of charity organization in the United States, 172-221.
Bernard, Thomas, 49.
Bicknell, Ernest P., 376.
Blizzard of 1899, Relief Problems of, 285, 286.
Boards of directors, duties of, 468-471, 513, 514.
Brackett, Jeffrey R., 306 fn.
Busch, Prof. J. G., 20.
Buzelle, George B., 196.

Cabot, Richard C., 367, 368, 416 fn.
Cannon, Ida M., 366.
Case-by-case method of finance, 160-162.
Case conference, 134-136.
  tests of an efficient, 454, 455.
Case records, 472-474, 510.
  uses of, 122, 123.
Causes of poverty, see Poverty, interest in causes of.
Causes of introduction of charity organization into the United States, 214, 215.
Central councils of social agencies, 106-109, 192, 346, 425-428, 441, 461.
  definition of, 107.
Chalmers, Thomas, 3, 27, 33-38, 57, 64, 132, 175.
Channing, William Ellery, 70.
Charities Buildings, 223.
Charities endorsement, 110-112, 419-422.
Charity a social force, 523.
Charity organization,
  criticisms of, 492-521.
  principles of, 114-171.
Charity organization movement in England and United States compared, 62 fn., 63 fn.

Charity Organization Department of The Russell Sage Foundation, 309, 343, 344, 351, 362, 363, 387, 388, 408, 417, 419.
Charity Organization Institute, 309, 310, 344, 363.
Charity organization society, definition of, 2, 105, 106.
functions of, 94-113.
Christianity and charity, 12.
"Church district plan" of organization, 243-248, 515 fn.
City conference and community planning, the, 424, 425, 461.
Cleveland Federation for Charity and Philanthropy, 429-433.
Closing of cases, a test of efficiency, 455, 456.
"Coldness" of scientific charity, 495-497.
Community planning and the city conference, 424, 425, 461.
Confidential exchange, 92, 93.
see also Social service exchange.
Co-operation, 128, 131.
improvement in, 409-410.
sources of, 136-139.
a test efficiency, 448-450.
Council of Charity Officers, 238-9.
Count Rumford, 28-32.
"Cost of giving a dollar away" criticism, 497-500.
Criticisms and prejudices, 492-521.

Daily committee work, 135, 136.
deForest, Robert W., 382, 513, 514.
Degerando, Baron, see Baron Degerando.
Democracy and charity, 506-509.
Denison, Edward, 3, 58-62, 149, 216, 287.
Departments of public welfare, 400, 401.
Dependent children, interest in, 303, 304.
Desertion, interest in, 319-323.
Devine, Edward T., 376, 382 fn.
Directors, boards of, duties of, see Boards of directors, duties of.
Disaster relief, 232-234, 352, 353, 375-377.
District committees, 134, 135.
suggested readings on, 136 fn.
District plan of organization, 131-134.
Dugdale's Study of the Jukes, 493.

Education, a function of a C. O. S., 96, 97, 146, 456, 517, 531, 539, 540.
Efficiency, tests of, 444-491.
Elberfeld system, 3, 44-49, 175, 178, 178 fn.
Ely, Richard T., 307 fn., 334.
Emergent relief, 161, 394 fn.
Emerson, Charles P., 366, 367.
Employment bureaus and C. O. S., 109.
Esprit de corps, maintaining, 480, 481.
Exchange bureau, 340.
Extension of the charity organization movement (1883-1895), 222-280.

Family as a social institution, 527-529.
Family, The, 346, 529.
Family rehabilitation, meaning of, 94-96.
Field Department of *Charities and the Commons,* 337, 338, 340, 341, 343, 363, 408.
Finance, 481-487.
cost of collecting, 485, 485 fn.
methods of, 482.
Financial exchange, 419.
Financial federation, 170, 171.
movement for, 428-436.
objections to, 436 fn.
Finley, John H., 236.
Forbes, James, 314 fn.
Foreign antecedents of the movement, 11-63.
Forms of organization among charity organization societies, 465-467.
Philadelphia plan, 132 fn., 189, 190, 205, 208, 213, 283, 284, 466.
St. Paul plan, 243, 425 fn., 466.
Forwarding centers, 341.
Frankel, Lee K., 305.
Fresh air work, interest in, 295, 296.
Friendly visiting, 149-156, 271, 272, 418, 453, 454.
definition of, 149, 150.
difficulties of, 154, 273.
objects of, 150, 151.
suggested readings on, 156 fn.
Future of charity organization, 531-541.

Germantown experiment, 4, 175-177, 196.
Gilman, Daniel C., 207, 337 fn.
Gladstone, William E., 56.
Glenn, John, 7, 32, 208, 337 fn., 514.
Government subsidies and charity organization societies, 170, 170 fn., 468, 519, 519 fn.
Green, Prof. T. H., 56.
Gurteen, S. Humphreys, 179, 180, 183 fn., 185, 210.

Hale, Edward Everett, 197, 235.
Hall, Fred S., 451, 452.
Hamburg system of poor relief, 3, 18-28, 287.
Handicapped, interest in special treatment of the, 369-371.
Hartley, Robert M., 32, 79, 80, 83-85, 88, 90, 91.
Henderson, Charles R., 211, 314 fn.
Higgins, Alice L., 376.
Hill, Alsagar, 56.
Hill, Octavia, 52, 56-58, 62, 149, 175, 178, 178 fn., 209, 216, 217, 287.
History of the charity organization movement in the United States, 172-443.
Home Economics, influence of, 411.
Homeless, case work with the, 229-231, 310-319, 356, 450.
Home Service, 437-440.
Hospital social service, 366-369.
Housing reform, interest in, 287-293.
Human behavior, attitude toward, 526, 527.

Immigrants, Social case work with, 416.
Improving social conditions, departments for, 301-303.
  responsibility for, 460-462.
Inactive cases, 456.
Industrial depression, of 1893-1894, 248-265.
  of 1907-1908, 379-381.
  of 1914-1915, 384-393.
Industry and charity, 383, 384.
  see also Unemployment and charity organization.
Industry and charity, see also Workmen's compensation, interest it.
Inebriate, the, 372, 373.
Information in social diagnosis, sources of, 118, 447, 448.
Interim relief, see Emergent relief.
Interviews, privacy during, 446, 447.
Investigation, 118, 329 fn.
  suggested readings on, 120 fn.
  see also Social diagnosis.

Johnson, Alexander, 8 fn., 235, 238 fn., 267 fn., 407.
Justice and charity, 540, 541.
Juvenile probation, interest in, 297-299.

Kellogg, Charles D., 211 fn.
Kingsley, Charles, influence of, 55.

Lazarites, 15.
Lee, Joseph, 305, 508.
Legal justice, 300, 301.
  see also Legal aid.
Legal aid, 299, 300.
LeGras, Mademoiselle, 16, 17.
Liverpool system of finance, 240, 240 fn., 433 fn.
  in Denver, 240-243.
Loch, Charles S., 35, 51, 366.
London Charity Organization Society, 53-63.
Los Angeles Municipal Charities Commission, 404-406.
Low, Seth, 193-195, 216.
Lowell, Mrs. Charles Russell, see Lowell, Josephine Shaw.
Lowell, Josephine Shaw, 7, 209, 335, 407, 503.

McCulloch, Oscar C., 7, 119 fn., 202, 202 fn., 203, 236, 237, 457, 458.
McLean, Francis H., 329 fn., 362 fn., 382 fn.
Manchester School of Economics, influence of, 217.
Maurice, Frederick Denison, influence of, 55.
Medical social work, 366-369.
Municipal Charities Commission of Los Angeles, see Los Angeles Municipal Charities Commission.

National Association of Societies for Organizing Charity, 344, 345, 346 fn.
see also American Association for Organizing Family Social Work.
National Conference of Charities and Correction, later National Conference of Social Work, 174, 174 fn., 217.
National Desertion Bureau, 322.
National Employment Exchange, 382.
Nationalization of charity organization movement, 337-406.
Natural selection and philanthropy, 493, 494.
Negro problem in South and charity organization, 357, 358.
Newman, Cardinal, 56.
New York School of Philanthropy, The, 223 fn., 308, 309.
Non-support, 319-323.

Office management, criticism of, 474, 475, 514.
Organizing charity, meaning of, 139-141.
Ozanam, Frederick, 3, 18, 38-44, 59.

Paine, Robert Treat, Jr., 7, 163 fn., 206, 228, 337 fn., 399 fn., 502, 513.
"Passing on," see Transportation agreement.
Patten, S. N., influence of, 307 fn., 334 fn.
Peabody, Francis G., 307 fn., 334.
Pellew, Henry E., 177, 179.
Pennsylvania School for Social Service, The, 309.
Personal service in charity organization, 144, 145.
"Philadelphia plan," see forms of organization among charity organization societies.
Philanthropic publication, 191, 234-238, 239, 304-306.
Philosophy of charity organization, 522-529.
Pioneer societies,
Baltimore, 207, 208.
Boston, 178, 179, 197-201.
Brooklyn, 193-196.
Pioneer societies—*Continued.*
Buffalo, 179-186.
Cambridge, 207.
Cincinnati, 205.
Cleveland, 207.
Detroit, 204, 205.
Gemantown, 175-177.
Indianapolis, 202, 203.
Lowell, 207.
New Haven, 186, 187.
Newark, 211.
Newport, 196, 197.
New York, 177, 178, 209-211.
Philadelphia, 86, 187-193.
Salem, N. J., 207.
Syracuse, 196.
Taunton, 207.
Terre Haute, 211.
Washington, 208.
Pittsburgh Survey, 305, 306, 383.
Poor Law Reform of 1834, 54, 55, 59, 61.
Poverty, interest in causes of, 456.
interest in prevention of, 100, 104, 281-336, 381-384.
Press and charity organization, 458, 487, 488, 515, 516.
Principles and methods of charity organization, 114-171.
Probation work, interest in, 297-299.
Promptness of service, a test of efficiency, 167, 446.
Propaganda, 487, 488.
Provident Loan Society of New York, 228, 229.
Psychiatric social work, 414, 415.
Public and private relief, co-operation between, 98, 99, 354, 364, 400-406.
Iowa plan, 402-404.
see also Los Angeles Charities Commission.
Public outdoor relief, charity organization and, 170, 183, 184, 188, 190, 191, 271, 399-401.
changing attitude toward, 399-401.
Publicity and charity organization societies, 457-460.
Public work in emergency relief, 259, 261, 387, 388.
Putnam, Dr. Charles P., 178.

Qualifications for family case work, 462, 463.
Quincy, Josiah, report on the pauper laws of Massachusetts, 68.

Registration, 123-125, 179, 269, 270.
Relation of case work to community work, 460-462.
Relief, changed attitude toward, 323-325.
early attitude toward, 219, 220.
inadequacy of, 166 fn., 511, 512, 518, 519.
meaning of, 156, 157.
suggested readings on, 160 fn.
Shall a C. O. S. maintain a general relief fund? 160-168.
Shall a C. O. S. supply relief for specialized agencies? 100.
sources of, 160-171.
standards of living as standards of, 158, 159.
Relief, public outdoor, see Public outdoor relief.
Relief societies, relationship with, 88 fn., 162-165, 166 fn., 168, 169, 325-330.
Remedial loans, interest in, 227-229.
Re-opening of cases, test of efficiency, 455, 456.
Resources available for the work of rehabilitation, see Co-operation, sources of.
Richmond, Mary E., 97, 98, 107, 128, 151, 164, 165, 212, 308, 332, 417, 451, 452.
Riis, Jacob A., 305.
Robertson, Frederick William, 55.
Rumford, Count, see Count Rumford.
Ruskin, John, 56, 57 fn.
Russell Sage Foundation, 460, 461.
Russell Sage Foundation, Charity Organization Department, see Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation.

"St. Paul plan" of organization, see forms of organization among charity organization societies.
Saint Vincent de Paul, contribution of, 14-18.
Society of, 39-44.
Salaries as a test of personnel, 464, 465.
Sanborn, Frank, 174 fn., 334.
San Francisco fire and charity organization, 375-377.
Schuyler, Louisa Lee, 209.
Shaler, Prof. N. S., 152.
Smaller communities and charity organization, 104, 105, 363-365.
Smith, Zilpha D., 71 fn., 119 fn., 155, 178 fn., 182 fn., 320, 407.
Social case work, definition of, 114.
renaissance of, 407-418.
universal application of, 532-535.
Social case treatment, 136-171.
illustration of, 139, 140.
Social diagnosis, 117-136.
improvement in, 414-417.
meaning of, 117, 118.
see also Investigation.
Social justice, interest in, 277, 278, 504, 505, 540, 541.
Social philosophy of charity organization, 522-529.
Social reform and family case work, 102-104, 330-336, 373, 374, 519-521, 530, 531, 536-540.
see also Relation of social case work to community work.
Social service exchange, 113, 409, 410, 449, 517.
development of, 125-128.
services of, 126, 127.
Society of Saint Vincent de Paul, see Saint Vincent de Paul, Society of.
Soup-houses, 66 fn., 75, 75 fn., 283, 283 fn., 311.
Sources of information in social diagnosis, see Information in social diagnosis, sources of.
South and charity organization, the, 347-358.
Southwest and charity organization, the, 360, 361.
Stamp savings, 197.
Standard of living, as a basis for relief, 157-159, 409, 448, 451, 452.
see also Relief, standards of living as standards of.
Standards and tests of efficiency, 444-491.
Statistics, difficulty in use of, 8, 9.
Supervision of workers, 476-479.
Syndic Sillen, 19.

Taylor, Graham, 305.
Tests of efficiency, see Efficiency, tests of.
Thompson, Benjamin, see Count Rumford.
Trained personnel, a test of efficiency, 452, 453, 479, 480.
  increase in, 333, 334.
Trained worker defined, 452, 453.
Training for social work, 306-310.
Transportation agreement, 318, 319, 346, 358, 450.
Trevelyan, Sir Charles, 56, 58.
Tribe of Ishmael, study of, 236, 237.
Tuberculosis, movement for the prevention of, 293-297, 349, 351, 353, 356.
  home hospital experiment, 297 fn.
Tuberculosis, National Association for the Study and Prevention of, 294.
Tuckerman, Joseph, 70-76, 92, 197, 216.

Unemployment and charity organization, 381-383.
United States Industrial Commission, 383, 384.

Vagrancy, 318 fn.
  attitude of the charity organization society toward, 310-319.
Veiller, Lawrence, 289.
Vincentians, see Lazarites.
Volunteer service, 145-156.
  improvement in, 417, 418, 465.
  kinds of, 146.
  purposes of, 418, 459, 478 fn.
Von der Heydt, 45, 47, 178.
Von Voight, Casper, 20, 23, 24, 27, 28.

Wages as affected by charity, 512, 513.
Warner, Amos G., 64, 89, 170 fn., 207 fn., 208, 223, 238, 334, 407.
Wayfarers' lodges, 316, 317.
Wayland, Rev. H. L., 277, 278.
Welfare Federation, 441, 442.
  see also Financial Federation.
West and charity organization, the, 358-360.
Whewall, Dr., 56.
White, Alfred T., 194, 288.
Widows' pension legislation, attitude toward, 393-399, 511, 512.
Workmen's compensation, interest in, 170, 370, 442 fn., 512.
Work test, the, 121, 380, 389, 390.
World War and charity organization, 437-440.

Yates, J. V. N., Report of the Secretary of State, N. Y. in 1824 on the Relief and Settlement of the Poor, 68-70.
Years 1883-1895 in retrospect, 266-280.
Years 1896-1904 in retrospect, 330-336.
Years 1905-1921 in retrospect, 440-443.

BOUND BY
HNM

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 039616401